UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
x	
SKYLINE STEEL, LLC,	
Plaintiff,	
V.	13 CV 8171 (JMF)
DILEDDO LLO	
PILEPRO, LLC,	Trial
Defendant.	
x	
	New York, N.Y. November 29, 2016 9:18 a.m.
	3110 a.m.
Before:	
HON. JESSE	M. FURMAN,
	District Judge
APPEAI	RANCES
MINOTON C CEDAMN LLD	
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP Attorneys for Plaintiff BY: ALDO A. BADINI	
MERRITT D. WESTCOTT FRANK S. RESTAGNO	
JULIO J. RAMOS	
Attorney for Defendant - and -	
CONLEY ROSE, PC	
BY: DARLENE F. GHAVAMI - and -	
THE BROWN FIRM LLC BY: ANDREW BROWN	

1 (Case called) MR. BANDINI: Good morning, your Honor. Aldo Badini 2 3 for Skyline Steel LLC. 4 MS. WESTCOTT: Merritt Wescott for Skyline Steel. 5 MR. RESTAGNO: Good morning, your Honor. Frank 6 Restagno for Skyline Steel. 7 MR. DeMEY: Good morning. Laurent De Mey for Skyline 8 Steel. 9 THE COURT: All right. 10 MR. RAMOS: Julio Ramos for the PilePro defendants. 11 Good morning. MS. GHAVIMI: Darlene Ghavimi for PilePro LLC. 12 13 Andy Brown for PilePro. MR. BROWN: 14 THE COURT: Good morning to all of you. Welcome 15 Ms. Ghavimi and Mr. Brown to New York. There are a couple of deposition designation 16 17 objections that I had reserved judgment on pending discussion with you. In particular, some relevance objections that at 18 this point I have an inadequate basis to sort of understand 19 20 where the relevant testimony fits in or doesn't, as the case 21 may be. 22 So that is on my agenda. Is there anything else that 23 we need to discuss? I think I've resolved all of -- other than

So that is on my agenda. Is there anything else that we need to discuss? I think I've resolved all of -- other than the ones that I explicitly reserved on, I resolved all the objections in the first four depositions that Skyline had

24

25

submitted. I didn't realize until I went through it this morning there were no objections in the Wheeler, L.B. Foster depositions. I don't think there are any issues there.

So we'll turn to the relevance objections that I had reserved on in a moment. Anything else? Ms. Ghavimi seems to be popping up and down.

MS. GHAVIMI: Yes, your Honor. There was one issue with respect to the Madonna transcript. This was discovered last night during the parties' meet and confer. It regards PilePro's counterdesignations. When PilePro --

THE COURT: Could you move the microphone. The acoustics in here are quite poor, so you really need to make sure that you speak into the microphone. Go ahead.

MS. GHAVIMI: When PilePro made its counterdesignations, I was making those counterdesignations. was using a text version of the transcript. And when Skyline interpreted those, they used a condensed version of the transcript; and, therefore, the actual testimony that was designated was incorrect. We only discovered this last night. However, we're at an impasse as to what to do about it. Therefore, the objections that they made were not really the testimony that was actually designated two months ago.

I have a highlighted version of the transcript with the actual counterdesignations that were made two months ago for your review, and I sent this to Skyline's counsel this

morning for them to review as well.

where this issue comes from? You designated these things on September 30, and it's now November 29. The notion that you would discover this the night before we're scheduled to start trial, I don't understand, and I don't understand what you mean by condensed version versus text version. The whole point of having page numbers and line numbers is so everybody is working on the same page and can actually be talking about the same testimony. So I don't understand even what you're talking about.

MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, I absolutely agree.

Unfortunately, we didn't -- this was an honest mistake. The parties didn't realize it. Nobody reached out earlier to either -- to anybody to discover this. And the point is that what Skyline thought that PilePro designated was not what was actually designated because we were using a different version, a text version that is a rough version. That was the only copy that I had. I had just started coming onto the case only two days earlier. I was rushing to get this done. I used what I had. And what they objected to was not what I actually designated two months ago in submission with the pretrial order.

THE COURT: Well, I can tell you that what is not going to fly is "I'm new to the case and that should excuse my

mistake." Your client has been through, if my memory serves me, three or four different lawyers in this case. The fact that they chose to bring on a new lawyer at the last minute is not going to justify your failing to deal with whatever you should have dealt with.

So now that's a general comment. Mr. Badini or someone at the front table want to tell me your thoughts or what the issues are here.

MR. BANDINI: Your Honor, my colleague, Mr. Restagno, will address this motion in detail. I will make one comment, though, which is that it is not true that we did not reach out and point out that there were problems. And Mr. Restagno can address the issue.

MR. RESTAGNO: Your Honor, good morning.

THE COURT: Microphone, please.

MR. RESTAGNO: Yes. Skyline most certainly made clear the problems with PilePro's designations in the pretrial order by objecting very clearly each time on the specific grounds of incomplete designation or, in some cases, improper counterdesignation. We created those designations specifically to highlight the fact that there were some incoherent citations to the transcript. PilePro has been on notice of this for two months, since the filing of the pretrial order with those objections.

And furthermore, your Honor, for PilePro now to argue

that they were — that this was the only copy that they had is inconsistent with the fact that their primary designations on the very same testimony that counsel is talking about are correct. They line up. She's talking only about their counterdesignations, which for some reason was based on some other transcript that we knew nothing about until — which we did not see until this morning.

MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, if I may just address those points. The counter -- the initial primary designations were correct. As I explained to counsel last night when we discussed this issue, were made by Mr. Ramos. He was working from a Word -- a paper copy, which had the correct -- which was different from the copy that I had. And they made objections to my -- to the counterdesignations of PilePro, yes, and the parties attempted to meet and confer on both parties' deposition designations, counterdesignations, and objections, but we were told on multiple occasions by Ms. Wescott that we would delay this meet and confer because Skyline was in the process of paring down its deposition designations. And therefore, we waited, and the issue was tabled until last night.

THE COURT: Well, I think in a moment we should talk about what is specifically at stake here, but I do have a question. I'm looking at the original counterdesignations and objections that were filed with the joint pretrial order on

September 30, and there is, for example, a counterdesignation on page 17 -- excuse me, page -- actually, forget that.

Why don't you tell me what's specifically at stake here. I have to tell you, I'm -- you have an uphill battle here because I'm looking at the original counterdesignations and objections, and they correspond with exactly what was submitted last night. You had two months to raise that. Your letter last night is another example of where one lawyer says something, and you come in and you say something else. That's not going to fly here. You speak on behalf of your client.

He's hired multiple lawyers. That's fine by me if you're all on the same page. What I'm not going to allow you to do is let one lawyer stand up to say: This is not issue, Judge, and we consent this, and another lawyer to come in at the 11th hour, the night before we scheduled for trial and say we're going to re-argue this point. That's not happening in this courtroom, all right. And this seems like another instance of that.

Now, if you want to talk about specifics, let's talk about specifics, but you have an uphill battle here. Go ahead.

MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, I'm not trying to retract the counterdesignations that were made two months ago.

THE COURT: No, but you are trying to change the landscape of your counterdesignations. I have ruled on the objections with respect to your counterdesignations and

sustained any number of those objections because, frankly, the counterdesignations were incoherent. They were incomplete. To pick an example, on page 17 the counterdesignation starts on the second line of a two-line question, and that includes a question but not the answer. They're obviously patently problematic, no pun intended.

You've had two months to realize that and to look at it, and I don't know if that's on you or if that's on Mr. Ramos. But what you can't do is come to me the morning trial is supposed to start and say: Oops, we messed up. One of us didn't look at it. That's just not the way this process works. It's not fair to Skyline, it's not fair to me, and it's not the way the process works.

MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, if I may submit a copy of the actual testimony that was supposed to be designated, and I can explain to you specifics?

THE COURT: You may. Do you have a copy for Skyline?

MS. GHAVIMI: I do. For example --

THE COURT: Hold on. All right. You may proceed.

MS. GHAVIMI: If you go to page -- the bottom says page 16, but that's not the actual page of the transcript. The page of the transcript are the numbers that are on the right-hand side.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. GHAVIMI: So in the middle of the page you see 19

on the right-hand side above it. 1 2 THE COURT: Yes. 3 MS. GHAVIMI: The actual designations for page 18 was 4 line 18 to 21: "Question: Did Skyline Steel furnish this 5 indemnification to" --6 THE COURT: You need to read more slowly so the court 7 reporter can take your -- take down what you're saying. But I 8 can also read, so you don't need to read. 9 MS. GHAVIMI: Okay. I will not read it into the 10 record. However, this was the intended designation, not an 11 incomplete, nonsensical designation. For example, another 12 example, turning to the next page --13 THE COURT: Where does this correspond to the actual 14 transcript that was submitted to me last night? 15 MS. GHAVIMI: It is the same page number and line 16 number, 19 -- well --17 THE COURT: No, it's not, because that's --18 MS. GHAVIMI: Where does it correspond? I apologize. I have not done that correspondence. I can find it. 19 20 THE COURT: Seems to be page 23, lines 7 through 10, 21 which I don't know what to tell you. Not to mention it seems 22 to be designated, if I'm not mistaken, by Skyline. 23 MS. GHAVIMI: This is how this mistake occurred. 24 what we're just asking is, yes, this section is already 25 designated by Skyline, but other counterdesignations are not.

And we --

battles and tell me which ones are absolutely critical to you, because right now I'm not allowing you to redo any of this because it's on you. The fact that Mr. Ramos correctly designated your affirmative designations makes abundantly clear that PilePro had the correct transcript. You could have worked off it. You could have corresponded with one another and made sure you were on the same page. And the fact that you didn't and didn't realize it until last night is your fault, not my fault.

What can't happen is at the 12th hour at this point to basically shift the sands of the foundations of the way this process works and start over. It's just not going to happen. So if you want to pick your one or two that you are most concerned about, I'll look at them and I'll consider it, but right now it's not going to fly.

MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, the one we're most concerned about is page 51 in this text document.

THE COURT: Meaning at the bottom it says page 51?

MS. GHAVIMI: Yes. Yes, at the bottom page 51.

THE COURT: And the entire portion that's highlighted in blue?

MS. GHAVIMI: Yes. And I see that that's been designated by Skyline.

THE COURT: Yes, this entire part is already in. 1 All right. We're done with this. Let's move on to 2 3 the next issue. Is there anything beyond the relevance objections that I reserved judgment on? 4 5 All right. Then let's deal with those. I'm told that 6 we should have a jury pool in a matter of minutes, so we'll 7 continue until we have the jury here, at which point we will obviously begin with voir dire. 8 9 Let's start with the McShane deposition transcript, 10 the March 12 deposition testimony. First is page 40. Well, looks like we have a jury pool here, so we will table this 11 12 until another time. 13 MS. WESTCOTT: Your Honor, at some point we do need to 14 talk about some objections to demonstratives used in opening. 15 THE COURT: We'll have an opportunity to do that 16 before openings. 17 MS. WESTCOTT: Okay. 18 THE COURT: I did ask if there was anything else, and nobody said anything. But in any event, we will proceed with 19 20 jury selection and then take those up at a break. 21 (Jury selection ensued) 22 (Continued on next page) 23 24 25

(In open court)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(A jury of 8 people were chosen and sworn)

THE COURT: You may be seated. So, when you come back in the jury room after our break, I think it would make sense for you to sit in the first row and then jurors number 7 and 8 in the second row. If you could remember who is to your left or right or essentially what number juror you are, if you line up in that order as you come out, it will just make it easier, and Ms. Johnson can just fill in the first row and everybody else down to seat number six, and then jurors numbers 7 and 8 can just find seats in the second row.

Now, good morning. It's still morning. This case is now officially on trial. As stated earlier, the trial is scheduled to last no more than two weeks, but I hope that it may end even sooner than that. We will begin tomorrow and additional days thereafter at 9 o'clock, and to help ensure that we can start on time, please be in the jury room no later than a few minutes before nine. I will actually deal with issues with the lawyers at nine, but shortly after nine, at 9:15 I hope each day we will be able to start promptly with the portion of the case that involves you. But to do that you need to be here on time. We can't begin until all eight of you are So, I will ask you and remind you as we break today make sure you are here on time tomorrow so that we can begin without delay. As an enticement for you to begin on time, I have

arranged to get some breakfast and coffee for you in the jury room. As I told you, we will, beginning tomorrow, take one and only one break and a relatively short one at that, about 30 minutes, so you should, number one, really given how short the break is, plan to remain in the jury room during the break, but you may want to bring some food or small snack or even a small lunch to tide you over until the end of the day, and we will finish each day at 2:30 as I mentioned.

Now, the food that we get you for the morning may also be enough to get you through the day, but in any event, I will leave that to you.

Now that you have been sworn, let me give you some instructions about your duties as jurors. At the end of the trial I will give you more detailed instructions, and those instructions will control our deliberations in this case. But for now let me explain how the trial will proceed.

The first step in the trial will be the opening statements. First, the plaintiff's lawyer will make an opening statement, and then the defendant's lawyer will make an opening statement.

Opening statements are neither evidence nor argument; they are simply outlines to help you understand the evidence as it is presented. After opening statements the plaintiff will present its evidence. The plaintiff's evidence will consist of the testimony of witnesses as well as documents and exhibits.

And witnesses will be testifying live here in person in the witness box. You will also see some witness testimony through what are known as depositions, which are essentially videotaped examinations of the witness, and I will explain that to you more fully at the time.

So, the plaintiff's evidence will consist, as I said, of the testimony of witnesses, as well as documents and exhibits. Plaintiff's lawyer will examine the witnesses, and the defendant's lawyer may cross-examine them. Following the plaintiff's case, the defendant may present a case, and if it does, the plaintiff's lawyer will have an opportunity to cross-examine any witnesses testifying for the defendant.

After the presentation of evidence is completed, the lawyers will deliver their closing arguments to summarize and interpret the evidence. Just as the lawyers' opening statements are not evidence, their closing arguments are not evidence either. Following closing arguments, I will instruct you on the law. Then you will retire to deliberate on your verdict which must be based solely on the evidence presented at trial. All of you must agree on any verdict. And while that verdict will obviously be public, your deliberations are secret. You will never have to explain your verdict to anyone.

It is important to remember that this is a civil case. You may have heard of the "beyond a reasonable doubt" standard that applies in criminal cases. That requirement does not

apply in a civil case, and you should put it entirely out of your mind. In civil cases, the burden is different, and it is called proof by a preponderance of the evidence. To establish facts by a preponderance of the evidence means to prove that the fact are more likely are true than not true. I will, however, instruct you fully on the burden of proof after all of the evidence has been received.

Now let me explain the jobs that you and I are to perform during the trial. I will decide which rules of law apply to the case. I will decide that by making legal rulings during the presentation of the evidence and, also, as I told you, in giving the final instructions to you at the close of the evidence and the closing arguments of the lawyers.

In order to do my job, I may have to interrupt the proceedings from time to time to confer with the lawyers about the rules of law that should apply here. Sometimes we may talk here at the bench, at the side bar, as we did during some of jury selection, out of your hearing, but some of the conferences may take more time than others, and as a convenience to you, I may excuse you from the courtroom. I assure you that I will try to keep any such interruptions to an absolute minimum, and indeed will hope to avoid them altogether. But please be patient and understand that these conferences are necessary to ensure the fairness of the trial and that ultimately they do serve to make the trial move

faster. While I decide the law that applies to the case, you, the members of the jury, are the triers of fact. You will weigh the evidence presented and decide whether the plaintiff has proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant is liable to it. You must pay close attention to all of the evidence presented, and you must base your decision only on the evidence in the case and my instructions on the law.

What then is evidence? Evidence consists only of the testimony of witnesses, documents and other things admitted as evidence, or stipulations agreed to by the parties. Some of you probably have heard the terms circumstantial evidence and direct evidence. Do not be concerned with these terms for now. You are to consider all the given in this trial. Certain things are not evidence and must not be considered by you. The following is a list of what is not evidence.

First, arguments, statements and questions by the lawyers are not evidence, nor are statements that I make or questions that I ask of a witness.

Second, objections to questions are not evidence.

Lawyers have an obligation to make an objection if they believe that evidence being offered is improper under the rules of evidence. You should not be influenced by the objection or by my rulings on any objection. If an objection is sustained, ignore the question and any answer that may have been given.

If an objection is overruled, you should treat the answer like

any other. If you are instructed that some item of evidence is received for a limited purpose only, you must follow that instruction as you do all my instructions.

Third, testimony that I have excluded or told you to disregard is not evidence and must not be considered.

Fourth, anything that you have seen or heard outside the courtroom is not evidence and must be disregarded. You are to decide the case solely on the evidence presented here in the courtroom. There is no formula to evaluate testimony or exhibits. For now, suffice it to say, that you bring with you into this courtroom all of experience and background of your lives. Do not leave your common sense outside the courtroom. The same types of tests that you use in your everyday dealings are the tests that you should apply in deciding how much weight, if any, to give to the evidence in this case. The law does not require you to accept all of the evidence admitted at trial. In determining what evidence you accept, you must make your own evaluation of the testimony from each of the witnesses and the exhibits that are received in evidence.

It is essential, however, that you keep an open mind until you have heard all of the evidence in the case. A case can be presented only step by step, witness by witness, before all the evidence is before you. As you know from experience, you can hear one person give his or her version of an event and think it sounds very impressive or even compelling and yet upon

hearing another version of the same event, or even the same person cross-examined with respect to the event, things may seem very different. In other words, there may be another side to any witness's story. You should use your common sense and good judgment to evaluate each witness's testimony based on all of the circumstances. Again, I cannot emphasize too strongly that you must keep an open mind until the trial is over. You should not reach any conclusions until you have all the evidence before you.

Finally, let me caution you about certain rules and principles governing your conduct as jurors in this case.

First, you must not talk to each other about this case or about anyone who has anything to do with the case until the end of the case when you go to the jury room to decide on your verdict. The reason for this requirement is that you must not reach any conclusion on the claims or defenses until all of the evidence is in and you have heard my instructions. As I have said, keep an open mind until you start your deliberations at the end of the case.

Second, do not communicate with anyone else about this case or with anyone who has anything to do with it, until the trial has ended and you have been excused or discharged as jurors. "Anyone else" includes members of your family and friends, and "no communicating" about the case means no communicating in any way, shape or form, in person, by e-mail,

by telephone, by text, on Facebook, Twitter, Google, blogs or whatever, at all. You may tell your family and your friends, as well as your employer, that you have been selected as a juror in a civil case, but, please, do not tell them anything else about the case until you have been discharged by me. You may think that tweeting something or posting something on Facebook is harmless, but I can assure you that it isn't. And if you do anything like that, that is, tweet or post anything about the trial or about the participants in the trial, it will be major inconvenience to everyone involved in the trial, including and maybe especially to you, so don't do it.

Third, do not let anyone talk to you about the case or about anyone who has anything to do with it. If any person should attempt to communicate with you about this case at any time throughout the trial, either in or out of the courthouse, you must immediately report that to my deputy, Ms. Smallman, and to no one else. When I say report that communication to no one else, I mean that you should not tell anyone, including your fellow jurors.

To minimize the probability of any such improper communication, it is important that you go straight to the jury room when you come in in the morning and that you remain in the jury room for the duration of the trial day other than when you are in the courtroom.

Ms. Smallman, after I excuse you, will show you where

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the jury room is and also show you where the door is to the That is to say after you are excused, you should jury room. not come into the main door of the courtroom. There may be other proceedings going on, or I may be discussing things with the lawyers. You should go directly into the jury room using the designated door that Ms. Smallman will show you. addition, you should use the bathrooms in the hallway right outside the jury room rather than the bathrooms that are in the lobby of this floor or elsewhere in the courthouse. As you were probably already told, you should not use the courthouse cafeteria. I apologize for that on such a rainy or dreary day, but you should get food or refreshments outside the courthouse rather than in the cafeteria. And you should not linger in the public areas of the courthouse on this floor or elsewhere.

Now, given that beginning tomorrow we will be taking only one break, it is, as I mentioned earlier, best that you remain in the jury room if you can.

Fourth, do not do any research or investigation about the case, or about anyone who has anything to do with the case on your own. Don't go visit anyplace described in the trial. Don't read, or listen to, or watch any news reports about the case. Don't go on the Internet or use whatever digital or communications device it is that you use to see what you can learn to inform yourself about this matter. That is because your decision in this case must be made solely on the evidence

presented at the trial. In other words, all that you need to know to decide this case will be presented here in open court by the parties. I expect you to inform me through Ms. Smallman if you become aware of another juror's violation of these instructions.

Finally, each of you will be given a notebook and a pen. I think what I will do is during the break we will actually put them on the seats in the jury box -- no, Ms. Smallman is shaking her head. Excuse me, they are already in the jury room. So, when you go to the jury room, Ms. Smallman can point them out to you, and you bring those with you when you come back after the break.

Now, this is because I permit jurors to take notes, but you do not have to take notes. Notes are just an aid to your own recollection. The court reporters in this case — the gentleman sitting right next to Ms. Smallman, and the woman who was here earlier — record everything that is said in the courtroom, and any portion of the testimony that you hear can be read back to you during your deliberations.

If you do take notes, be aware that note taking can distract you from something important that is happening here on the witness stand. And whether or not you take notes, you should rely on your own recollections and don't be influenced by the fact that another juror has taken notes. If you do take notes, all notes must be left each day in the jury room. We

will make sure that they are secure there.

From this point until the time that you retire to deliberate, it is your duty not to discuss this case and not to remain in the presence of other people who may be discussing this case. In that regard, please understand that the parties and the lawyers in the case have been instructed to have no contact with any of you. So, if you happen to see any of them outside the courtroom and they do not acknowledge you, say hello to you, make small talk, hold the door for you, or anything of that sort, please do not take offense. They are not being rude, I assure you. They are simply following my instructions to ensure that both parties get a fair trial in this case.

That concludes my preliminary instructions to you. As I said, what we're going to do now is break for an early lunch. It's 11:31. To ensure that you have enough time, that the lawyers have enough time, and that we can take care of a few remaining loose ends, I'm actually going to give you until one o'clock today. I am normally not going to give you that much time for a break, but today we will begin again at one o'clock. So, please be back in the jury room let's say at five or ten minutes to one. And again, Ms. Smallman will show you how to enter the jury room to ensure that you don't come into the courtroom before the appointed time.

A couple of reminders before I excuse you. Number

one, do not discuss the case with one another or with anyone else, with your friends, your family or your employers. As I mentioned, you may tell them that you have been selected to serve as a juror in a civil case, but you should tell them nothing else about the case. You should not discuss the case with one another. You will have your time when it comes time to deliberate, but until then it's important that you keep an open mind and that you not discuss the case with each other.

Do not communicate about the case with anyone in person, by e-mail, by phone or any means, and keep an open mind.

You obviously haven't heard the lawyers' opening statements. You haven't heard any of the evidence in the case. Really the case has not yet begun, so you don't know anything about the case, and you haven't heard a lick of evidence, so it's important that you keep an open mind.

Lastly, Mr. Woods, I know you had the appointments that you mentioned to me earlier. If you could during the break see if you can change those to the afternoon, after 2:30, when we will be ending each day. That would be great. And if you need my assistance in arranging that, you can let Ms. Smallman know, and I will do what I can to help make sure that that is not a problem for you.

With that, you are excused. Again, please be back in the jury room, let's say, by ten to one, so that we can start promptly at one o'clock, and I thank you for your attention,

and enjoy your lunches. Thank you. You can leave the questionnaires on your chairs.

(Jury not present)

THE COURT: All right. Let's deal with the issues that we need to address before openings. We will see how long that takes. And then maybe we can go over other ground, but otherwise we will take a break, let you guys get a bite as well and prepare for openings, and then we will proceed directly to the evidence after openings.

So tell me, there were some issues with respect to demonstratives and other issues that you mentioned.

MS. WESTCOTT: Yes, your Honor. Last night the parties exchanged the slides or exhibits that they were intending to use in opening. Last night PilePro had some objections to several of our slides which contain certain statements of fact. I think that that was probably addressed in your order of last night.

THE COURT: You mean statements of fact from the stipulations?

MS. WESTCOTT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Well, if they are on the stipulations, then I think that is settled by my order of last night.

MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, I would just like for preservation of the record to renew our objection to those

particular identify statement of facts.

THE COURT: All right. So preserved, but I don't think there is much to preserve there anyway. Next.

MS. WESTCOTT: Relatedly we had prepared a stipulation of those statements of fact, and I think it has been signed by both parties at this time, and we would like to admit it on stipulation.

THE COURT: Let's do that after openings when the evidentiary portion of the case begins. You can certainly offer it at that time. But since openings are the first step, we will wait until then.

MR. BADINI: Just so we understand the mechanics then, before we call our first witness we should just offer it as an exhibit?

THE COURT: I presume it's a stipulation between the parties. We offer exhibit whatever it is, you know, which is the stipulation of facts agreed to by the parties, yes.

MR. BADINI: Thank you, your Honor.

MS. WESTCOTT: With respect to PilePro's exhibits to be used in opening, they propose to use two different videos. Skyline objects to these videos.

The first video -- and I think that we have them available if your Honor would like to see them, but I can explain our objection -- the first video is of Mr. Wendt explaining his ideas for a new company. I don't know that it's

a member of the PilePro group, either called Origami Steel, that relates different patent and a method of making sheet piles using lasers. So we think that the video is irrelevant, first of all. Secondly, the beginning of the video makes statements such as "America used to be good at making things, and today we import everything." "These day American builders are forced to buy low quality steel from abroad and wait a long time for the orders." We believe this type of thing is prejudicial under 403, particularly given the fact that this case is about imported product from Europe.

THE COURT: And is this video on the exhibit list?

MS. WESTCOTT: No.

THE COURT: So I don't even understand on what basis it would be shown at all. What's the second video, before I hear from defense counsel?

MS. WESTCOTT: The second video, also not on the exhibit list, appears to be a presentation made at least four years ago about how the isheetpile website works. It's not exactly a walk-through of the isheetpile website, but it's more a PowerPoint presentation showing a mixed media of pages from catalogs and a person clicking through the website. So our objection to this would be of course we discussed using the live website in court. It was decided not to do that.

Mr. Ramos objected to us doing the live website. It seems kind of like an end-around in trying to get the website up, not to

mention the fact that it's four years old; it's not even the same website; it doesn't even appear the same.

THE COURT: The threshold objection I assume is it's not on the exhibit list and therefore it won't be in evidence.

MS. WESTCOTT: Yes.

THE COURT: OK. Mr. Ramos or Ms. Ghavimi, on what possible basis should be you be allowed to show this to the jury if it's not coming into evidence?

MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, these are demonstratives.

We are not intending to offer these into evidence, so of course they would not appear on our exhibit list. Skyline's opening statement has pictures in its PowerPoint presentation that are not on their exhibit list. And from what I understand they are not intending to offer those into evidence either.

The point of the -- let me take these first things first -- the point of the Origami Steel video is a company started and founded by Mr. Wendt. We are intending to show it to demonstrate Mr. Wendt as a business owner, an innovator, the fact that he has patents, he works in the steel business. The statement that Ms. Westcott stated was prejudicial does not mention Skyline or ArcelorMittal at all. It is referring to the industry as a whole. And it was created not in connection with this litigation; its a marketing video. It is intended to describe and exemplify the owner of PilePro and his business and describe him as an innovator in the industry. We are

certainly permitted to present our client in a positive light as a counterpoint to Skyline's opening presentation which highlights numerous holdings of this court that present our client in a negative light, for instance, the court has held that the Madonna letter was signed in bad faith.

(Continued on next page)

THE COURT: All right. You're not going to show that video. What about the second one?

MS. GHAVIMI: The second one is a tutorial of the iSheet Web site that was also created about four years ago. It just goes through how one would walk through the Web site were one to use it. It doesn't mention --

THE COURT: But also not on the exhibit list?

MS. GHAVIMI: It's not intended to be introduced into evidence. It's a demonstrative. It's intended to explain to the jury -- have them have a visual of the Web site. We're not intending to offer it into evidence.

THE COURT: But were you intending to show it to the jury?

MS. GHAVIMI: Yes.

THE COURT: On what basis and through whom?

MS. GHAVIMI: Intending to show it in the opening, and that's it.

THE COURT: Not happening. You don't get to show the jury things just for the sake of showing the jury things and, you know, persuading them — making arguments to the jury. You show the jury evidence. The jury can base its views and deliberations on the evidence. And if there is evidence, you can perhaps show it to the jury if it is appropriate to do, but you can't get up and show them things that aren't going to come into evidence. On top of which, four years ago is not within

the time frame of this case, as far as I'm aware. Given that, I don't think it would be appropriate. There's no foundation, and it's not relevant. So not happening.

Anything else that we need to resolve with respect to openings?

MS. WESTCOTT: No, your Honor, not with respect to openings.

THE COURT: All right. I have the relevance issues and the depositions that we can start to go through. Anything else aside from that?

MS. WESTCOTT: Your Honor, our first live witness will be Mr. De Mey. They have an objection to one of the exhibits we intend to use with him on direct. That objection is to Exhibit, Plaintiff's, 20, which is a copy of the ArcelorMittal patent that is prior art --

THE COURT: You've got to keep your voice up. Say again.

MS. WESTCOTT: I'm sorry. They're objecting to Plaintiff's Exhibit 20. This is the U.S. patent to ArcelorMittal that we are contending is prior art to PilePro's patent in this case.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. WESTCOTT: Their objection -- I'm sorry, your Honor. Their objection is relevance. They don't believe it's relevant to the case anymore.

THE COURT: Why do you think this is relevant since infringement and invalidity are not, at least directly, at issue?

MS. WESTCOTT: The jury will not be asked to determine the question of whether the patent is valid; however, if a person accuses someone of infringing a patent that it knows to be or should know to be invalid, that is also bad faith.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Ghavimi.

MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, it's our position that Mr. De Mey's belief about the validity or invalidity of the '543 patent is completely irrelevant to Mr. Wendt's belief about the validity of a patent and his --

THE COURT: Hold on. I didn't hear anyone suggesting that Mr. De Mey was going to be testifying, sharing his belief, about the validity of the patent. I agree with you. I don't know what relevance that would have. The sole issue is just whether the patent itself is admitted into evidence, as I understand it.

MS. GHAVIMI: I can't see what other purpose they would be asking questions of Mr. De Mey and this patent. He is not the inventor. He's not any patent attorney who worked on the patent. He has no knowledge. I don't see how he can — how they could lay a foundation or he could authenticate it.

THE COURT: All right. I'll reserve judgment on that, see if proper foundation is laid. If it is, I'll give you my

ruling at the time.

Anything else aside from the deposition designations?

MS. GHAVIMI: No, your Honor.

MS. WESTCOTT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So let's talk about those, since we have a little bit of time now. Again, I think I was starting with the March 12 deposition of Mr. McShane, page 40. There is a relevance objection. And, again, just at this point in time, without having heard your openings or much evidence and notwithstanding my lengthy involvement in this case, I just am having a hard time evaluating the relevance objections. So it would be helpful to hear from you. If we can do this briefly one by one, that would be helpful.

I guess it's Skyline's objection, so why don't I hear first from Skyline.

MR. BANDINI: Your Honor, Mr. Restagno will be addressing this.

MR. RESTAGNO: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: This is page 40 and 41?

MR. RESTAGNO: Yes, that's right, your Honor. Our objections to this testimony are grounded in relevance, nonresponsiveness, and narration. But to focus on relevance, if the Court doesn't mind, we believe that this line of questioning is about — it's about McShane's involvement in Skyline's exploration into connector manufacturing. And so

it's not quite responsive to the question posed, which was — the question was his involvement in manufacturing. And the answer gets into the relative size of Skyline, saying that Skyline was on a growth campaign through acquisitions and organic growth to expand it to a billion-dollar-a-year operation. It also goes into the acquisition of PilePro.

So we think that this runs counter to the Court's ruling in the motion in limine pertaining to the relative size of the companies. It's an irrelevant topic, and we think it could distract the jury. Furthermore, this implicates facts that underlie the 2011 settlement agreement which would run afoul of the Court's motion in limine two barring evidence on prior litigations between the parties.

THE COURT: It doesn't mention the settlement.

All right. Ms. Ghavimi, Mr. Ramos, relevance?

MR. RAMOS: Your Honor, I think it's highly relevant. This is an unfair practices case, and the specific business conduct and comport of PilePro is at issue. This only provides the jury with understanding with respect to the prior and preexisting and, to some extent, continuing business relationship between Skyline and PilePro. It is highly relevant information, at least on the issue of background between the parties, how the parties got to the position that they're currently in in this litigation. And I think it's an issue that is highly relevant, and it is responsive to

understanding PilePro's market position and its competitive posture vis-a-vis Skyline.

MR. RESTAGNO: Well, your Honor, I just don't see how this is relevant to PilePro's accusations against Skyline vis-a-vis the HZM system and the '543 patent. This testimony is -- it really just seems to emphasize the relative size of the companies, which is just an irrelevant factor.

THE COURT: All right. I'll sustain the objection.

Next is page 203. Again Skyline objection, so 203,

line 24 to 204, line 14.

MR. RESTAGNO: Yes. Thank you, your Honor. We object on grounds of nonresponsiveness. The question posed was where did -- essentially asked for where Mr. Wendt obtained his information on lead times. And McShane's testimony toward the end, beginning particularly at line 12, that the O-Pile system was a short delivery and HZM was a product from Europe with very, very long lead times is nonresponsive to the question of where Mr. Wendt obtained that information. It's more of his opinion, and we object on those grounds.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ramos.

MR. RAMOS: On that one, your Honor, it's pretty clear on page 204, line 2 through lines 9, Mr. Wendt's response —

I'm sorry, Mr. McShane's response there in answering the question specifically addresses how Mr. Wendt obtained the information on lead times; how he had contacts with people in

Europe, with the mills there; how he had contact with L.B. Foster; how he was able to deduce the figures on lead times based on that information. And I thought that this case was partially an issue of the lead times and whether those were confusing the market participants.

MR. RESTAGNO: Your Honor, if I may?

THE COURT: Hold on, please.

MR. RESTAGNO: Of course.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to sustain the objection with respect to line 3, page 204, line 3 through 14, beginning with the word "but." I will allow the first portion of the answer: "I am sure we did discuss it. I don't recall the actual discussions." The rest will be omitted.

Next is page 219, lines 9 through 25. Skyline objection, so Mr. Restagno.

MR. RESTAGNO: Yes. Thank you, your Honor. Once again, we had testimony that implicates the settlement agreement between the parties, and it's an end run around your Honor's decision on motion in limine two disallowing evidence of prior litigations. Specifically, the questioning: "Did you ever complain to Skyline, anyone at Skyline, that Skyline was not, to your satisfaction, displaying the PilePro connectors on its marketing materials?" That was a duty that pertained to settlement agreement between the parties in a prior litigation.

THE COURT: Mr. Ramos.

MR. RAMOS: Just one second, your Honor.

I don't see, your Honor, how this has anything to do with the settlement agreement. It has no issue with respect to that. It's just a question and answer with respect to PilePro's contacts with Mr. Borger prior to the complaint being on file.

THE COURT: This references PilePro's -- that Skyline was not displaying PilePro connectors in its marketing materials satisfactorily. What does that have to do with this case which concerns PilePro's representations and advertising?

MR. RAMOS: Your Honor, I think it's important to understand what the business relationship was between the parties, how they were engaged in commerce, how the issue of competition has to be understood in that context with respect to their prior arrangement and prior course of dealings. I think the jury should understand that and should hear that type of testimony.

THE COURT: All right. Objection's sustained.

The next one is page 221, line 16 to 25.

Mr. Restagno.

MR. RESTAGNO: Yes, your Honor. Thank you. This appears to be just a continuation of the testimony that we were discussing before. It implicates the duties under --

THE COURT: Can you move the microphone a little closer, please.

MR. RESTAGNO: My apologies. This touches on the same issue that we just dealt with. This is, in effect, a continuation of the testimony that we had just addressed that implicated duties under the settlement agreement. It, in effect, asks what Skyline's response was to the inappropriate question asked before.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ramos.

MR. RAMOS: Again, your Honor, I would say that, in defense of this line of questioning, it pertains to the market conduct between PilePro and Skyline and the fact that Skyline was using harsh and sharp tactics vis-a-vis PilePro. And I believe the jury should understand the context of those business dealings as well.

THE COURT: Objection's sustained. That, I think, covers all disputes, objections, in the March 12 transcript. If I missed any, I'm sure you'll bring them to my attention.

Let's turn to the March 13 transcript beginning, I think, on page 40 as well. Can you give me one moment.

Page 40 to 41, again, it's Skyline's objection.
Mr. Restagno.

MR. RESTAGNO: Thank you, your Honor. Once again, we had testimony that calls into question the relative sizes of the two parties, and we believe inappropriately runs afoul of motion in limine three. Specifically, testimony concerning Skyline's possible acquisition of PilePro, which would

implicate a relative size relationship that we feel is inappropriate.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ramos.

MR. RAMOS: Once again, your Honor, this is showing the specific employee, Mr. McShane, and his understanding of where the market relationship was between PilePro and Skyline and the fact that that relationship was of material significance to Skyline to the degree that it was contemplating acquisition of PilePro.

THE COURT: And what relevance does that have to the claims in $\ensuremath{\mathsf{--}}$

MR. RAMOS: Again, I think this is a market conduct case, and it should be presented to the jury with respect to what the issues were at the beginning and of the decline in the relationship.

THE COURT: That objection is sustained as well.

Next is pages 62 to 63. Mr. Restagno.

MR. RESTAGNO: Thank you, your Honor. Calling the Court's attention to page 62, line 17:

"Q. It says that during your employment as a corporate officer at Skyline, you were personally involved in detailed discussions with counsel for Skyline regarding the litigation between Skyline and PilePro."

This has no relevance to the issues at hand. If your Honor will direct his attention to line 11 of the same page,

this testimony's based on a letter dated 2011. This is clearly testimony related to a prior litigation and improper.

THE COURT: Mr. Ramos.

MR. RAMOS: We believe that the jury should understand Mr. McShane's prior employment with Skyline and also the fact that by virtue of his prior employment, that there was basically breach of duty by Mr. McShane at PilePro in that he had divided loyalties between Skyline and PilePro and that his information at that particular point in time during the period of time when he was employed by PilePro, that that information should be provided to the jury in order to understand the credibility of Mr. McShane's testimony.

THE COURT: How does this inform the jury's evaluation of Mr. McShane's credibility?

MR. RAMOS: Well, it's our position, your Honor, that he was a disloyal employee of PilePro and that as a result of acts that he undertook, there was a market deterioration in PilePro's relationship with Skyline because he was there basically to undermine PilePro's ability to penetrate market sectors that Skyline was dominating.

THE COURT: But all this is, is concerning a letter, if I'm mistaken, from ArcelorMittal advising him of his obligations of confidentiality to Skyline, notwithstanding the fact that he was then working at a competitor, not to mention it's before the time period relevant to this case.

MR. RAMOS: I think it shows the depth of his relationship and that he had a lot of market information with respect to Skyline that — that shows in this particular context of Mr. McShane's testimony that he had divided loyalties, your Honor. He had a lot of information about Skyline.

THE COURT: Mr. Restagno, is there other testimony concerning the fact that Mr. McShane previously worked at Skyline that has been designated?

MR. RESTAGNO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So I'll sustain the objection on relevance and 403 grounds.

Now, I think there may be one more page, 71. I think I understand the objection. Mr. Ramos, you want to tell me why this is relevant and not confusing and prejudicial, given the reference to the settlement agreement.

MR. RAMOS: Your Honor, just one second here, your Honor. I would withdraw the designations that had anything to do with the settlement agreement, given the Court's prior ruling, but the remainder of the designated transcript we believe is relevant to the issue of showing what type of sales figures and market penetration PilePro had.

THE COURT: And what relevance does that have?

MR. RAMOS: Well, I think that -- isn't this case about business competition and how the parties are relating to

each other and how Skyline is basically trying to establish in the eyes of the jury that it, in fact, has been damaged by PilePro's acts? And I think the case law does show that, in this context, the ability of the fact-finder to determine damages can be established by sales figures by the competitor as well. So these are sales figures that show or at least an attempt to show by the witness the type of volume of sales that PilePro was undertaking on a year-to-year basis.

THE COURT: All right. You keep on saying this case is about the business relationship between the two entities. It's really not. It's about the claims that the plaintiff has brought against your client, and I don't think that -- to some limited extent the background and the relationship between the two entities may well inform that, but fundamentally, it's not about who treated who well; it's about whether they can sustain their burden of proof with respect to the specific claims that are brought.

In any event, in the absence, first of all, there's no explanation of what the settlement agreement is, let alone what time period we're talking. And in the absence of that testimony which you've withdrawn, there's absolutely no reference to when this testimony concerns. So I fail to see what relevance the size of PilePro has, really, at any time. And given the absence of any time frame for that, I will sustain that objection.

That does -- McShane -- yes, Mr. Restagno.

MR. RESTAGNO: Your Honor, if I may, and apologies for interrupting. We made, when we sent you the transcripts last night, an inadvertent omission to our objection annotations in this particular transcript. This is an objection that we made in our pretrial order filed with the Court. In fact, I could — if I might direct your Honor to docket 503-4, page 10, you'll find our objection lodged there. It's to the testimony that PilePro designated as page 103 of this transcript.

THE COURT: Designated or counter designated?

MR. RESTAGNO: Designated, your Honor. So you'll see when you turn to page 103 of the transcript that we submitted last night, there's nothing there, but Skyline did lodge an objection to that testimony in its pretrial order. It was a clerical error that kept it off this particular transcript that we e-mailed you last night.

For your Honor's convenience, if the Court hasn't found its way to the pretrial order yet --

THE COURT: I have.

MR. RESTAGNO: Oh, okay. You will note our objections are based on foundation, relevance, and speculation.

THE COURT: This is for only the portion on page 103 or also 104?

MR. RESTAGNO: It is on 103 and 104, that entire line of questioning. It's a little complex here, but I could walk

the Court through our objection.

THE COURT: What is the letter that's being discussed here?

MR. RESTAGNO: Precisely. That is unknown based on the designation. And if the Court were to read into the non-designated testimony, it would learn that it's from a letter that was sent to Parametrix, a letter that is not germane to this case. And what's particularly dangerous about this testimony is that it lacks that necessary background and could lead the jury to conclude or perhaps confuse them into thinking that this is testimony about the Madonna letter which is at issue in this case.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Ramos.

MR. RAMOS: Your Honor, that Parametrix letter, we had discussed this at the pretrial conference, and the Court at that particular point in time did address the issue of these additional letters. And the Court reserved judgment on the issue but did signify that if these were part to show a campaign by PilePro with respect to protecting its patents, then it could be admissible on that basis.

THE COURT: Are you offering the Parametrix letter?

MR. RAMOS: Your Honor, at this point in time, we

don't know what the testimony will hold or what the case in

chief is with respect to that.

THE COURT: Can you address Mr. Restagno's point that

in the absence of context, the jury won't have any idea what letter this testimony is even referring to.

MR. RAMOS: Well, in our case in chief, your Honor,
Mr. Wendt will describe the background related to the letters
that were going out by PilePro.

THE COURT: That's not my concern, and Mr. Wendt may well be permitted to do that. But if Mr. McShane's testimony is played to the jury and there's a discussion of this letter being signed by him, not Mr. Mitchell, and a description and a discussion about what's in the letter but no context or explanation of what letter is even being discussed, let alone shown to the jury, how are they to understand the relevance of this, and how is that not going to confuse them?

MR. RAMOS: I believe that the designation did specifically address identifying Exhibit 34 and that this was the letter that was sent by you to Parametrix. So it's not that it would be a confusing issue for the jury to understand that there was another letter sent to another entity by PilePro and that that one was part of their campaign of protecting what they in good faith believed was their rights to the '543 patent.

THE COURT: All right. That portion of the testimony is not actually designated.

MR. RAMOS: But it leads -- but it's actually mentioned in 104, lines 14 and 15:

Did Robert receive the letter to Parametrix?

I'm sure he did.

Do you recall?

Well, I recall some circulation. In fact, I think I did. I don't know if he did or did not, right sitting here. I don't know without being able to check.

So that Parametrix is specifically identified in that letter is relevant to the letter-writing campaign that PilePro had undertaken.

THE COURT: How does the discussion of the content of this letter, how is that relevant to the claims that are actually being tried?

MR. RAMOS: Well, it's going -- it's describing that this letter was not being sent out in a vacuum or that PilePro had some intent to harm Skyline willy-nilly. It said it occurred as a result of their counsel, Doug Mitchell, approving changes to the letter.

THE COURT: But I think that does run afoul of what I said the other day, which is that you can't introduce evidence of other letters to suggest that other letters were sent in good faith. Whether the other letters were sent in good faith or not is not relevant to the good faith, lack thereof, or damages with respect to the Madonna letter.

I said to the extent that there was limited testimony concerning the fact that this was part of a larger, you know,

campaign, that that would be one thing. But you can't essentially introduce good conduct as an effort to rebut their allegations with respect to bad conduct.

So, Ms. Ghavimi, you can say what you want to say, but I'm about to sustain the objection. Go ahead.

MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, they're introducing the fact that Boies, Schiller refused to sign the letter as evidence of bad faith, and so I think it's only in fairness that we can highlight this section to say — we're not using it to establish good faith of this letter. We're using it to say that the lawyer reviewed the letter, and it was sent out.

THE COURT: Mr. Restagno.

MR. RESTAGNO: Your Honor, there's a bit of sleight of hand going on here. What I think counsel for PilePro is saying is that we are offering evidence of PilePro's counsel's refusal to sign the Madonna letter as evidence of bad faith regarding the Madonna letter. That's completely apart from your Honor's ruling last week, which is that a lawyer's opinion of a letter that's not the Madonna letter has no bearing on the good or bad faith attendant to the Madonna letter.

MS. GHAVIMI: I would disagree, your Honor, when it's the same lawyer and this same letter with minor changes in the wording. And the emphasis is going to be on the fact that that lawyer did not have — that my client did not have an infringement, official infringement opinion, and that that

lawyer refused to -- it's a slide in their opening argument that that lawyer refused to sign the Madonna letter. I think that it's only equitable that we can introduce testimony from somebody other than our client who states that this letter was reviewed, and it was approved by Mr. Mitchell.

THE COURT: I would certainly agree as to the Madonna letter. Is there testimony from Mr. Mitchell, or otherwise, with respect to why he didn't sign the Madonna letter?

MS. GHAVIMI: There is, but there's -- but I don't think that your Honor's order in the pretrial conference preventing evidence about -- your order in good faith of the other letters excludes altogether all testimony about Mr. Mitchell's opinions on the other letters and whether he reviewed them or not and the process by which the campaign of letters was sent out, especially considering the fact that --

THE COURT: But my question is what's the nexus between Mr. Mitchell's decision not to sign this letter and discussions he may have had concerning this letter and the Madonna letter, which is what the claim in this case relates to?

MS. GHAVIMI: Because all of those letters were sent out contemporaneously in time. The discussions about sending letters all are involved in all of the same evidence and exhibits. There are many e-mails. Conversations all occurred about the same topic, whether to send a letter or not, who to

send them to. Mr. McShane discusses that. He decided it didn't matter. In this section he decided that it was -- he was to send the letter to Parametrix, but it didn't matter.

The jury's going -- the different individuals signed the letter. Skyline has another slide in their opening argument that Mr. Wendt signed the letter to Madonna. Well, also what's going to come into evidence is the letter to Skyline. Your Honor, from what I understand, correct me if I'm wrong, said that that was permissible evidence because the two were connected, indisputably connected. That letter was signed by Mr. Mitchell; and, therefore --

THE COURT: To Skyline?

MS. GHAVIMI: To Skyline.

THE COURT: To Skyline? I don't recall any discussion of a letter to Skyline.

MS. GHAVIMI: There was an infringement warning letter to Skyline signed by Doug Mitchell from Boies, Schiller on October 23, 2014, and then there was a November 1 letter sent to John Madonna that was signed by Mr. Wendt.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. GHAVIMI: And the witnesses discussed both of them inextricably, and Mr. Bandini mentioned during the pretrial conference that it may be impossible to separate the testimony of the two.

THE COURT: I think, if I remember correctly --

Mr. Bandini can correct me -- I thought he was referring to a letter that was sent, if I remember correctly, to the Army Corps of Engineers or some other entity involved in the Madonna project.

MR. BANDINI: That's correct, your Honor. That was the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers letter relating to the Madonna project.

THE COURT: I don't think those two are --

MS. GHAVIMI: Okay. Then that was my mistake. But in Mr. Mitchell's testimony, which I don't know yet if Skyline intends to offer in chief. They have not told us. They've --

THE COURT: He's certainly on the joint pretrial order.

MS. GHAVIMI: I know, but they have dropped some of their deposition testimony that they -- that was on the pretrial order, so it's possible.

However, in some of that testimony he talks about other letters and the decision surrounding whether to send the letters and the campaign of sending the letters and whether he reviewed it, and it certainly goes to the decision to place the infringement warning up on the Web site and what Mr. Wendt understood in terms of discussions with his attorneys. And Mr. McShane was an integral part of those discussions. He participated in them at the time.

THE COURT: And I have no doubt that if you -- if

there were testimony from Mr. McShane regarding Mr. Mitchell's decision not to sign the Madonna letter, that that would obviously be directly relevant and presumably admissible. My question is what bearing does this have on the lawyer's decision not to sign the Madonna letter?

MS. GHAVIMI: Because he's explaining — we believe that Mr. McShane as a participant in the discussions of the campaign gives context to the decision to send out the letters and the decision as to who reviewed them and why and, in particular, in rebuttal to certain facts that Skyline is going to present regarding the Madonna letter.

THE COURT: All right. I think this is a little bit of a close call, but I'm actually going to overrule the objection as long as page 102, lines 21 to 24, is included so that it's clear what letter is being discussed here. I think, given that page 103 does — the answer says: "If we are going to send these out to a lot of people, it doesn't make any difference who sends them."

I think that does have some bearing on who signed and sent the letter with respect to Madonna, and in that regard goes to — sounds like it may rebut or at least bear on an argument that Skyline is making. So I will overrule that objection, again, as long as the testimony on the prior page framing it and putting it in context is included.

Now, I think that covers all of McShane. I know we

GBTHSKY3

still have Maake, a handful of objections that I reserved judgment on. It's now 12:15, so I'm going to defer those until a later break so that you can get your own lunches, so I can get my own lunch, and we can be ready go at 1:00.

Anything else that must be raised or discussed before openings? This is your moment.

MR. BANDINI: No, your Honor.

MR. RAMOS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Please be back here at five minutes to 1:00. If you'd like, you can move the podium to the front of the jury box so that you're directly facing the jury, and at 1:00 o'clock we'll bring the jury out and start with openings. Enjoy your lunch.

MR. BANDINI: Thank you, your Honor.

(Lunch recess)

AFTERNOON SESSION

1:00 p.m.

(Jury not present)

THE COURT: My deputy tells me you have an issue. What's the issue?

MR. BADINI: Your Honor, earlier this morning after your ruling on the statement of undisputed facts, we asked whether they would sign the stipulation in the form preferred by the court which we had prepared as Plaintiff's Exhibit 585. Counsel informed Ms. Westcott that they would. Coming back from lunch we are now informed by counsel for PilePro that none of them have authority to sign such a stipulation.

I don't know why, given how smoothly everything has gone in this case, but we expected a possible problem, so we prepared an alternative version which we shared with counsel I think at the pretrial conference, which does not have the caption and the signature page, but the court may simply tell the jury that it's stipulated to. So, I don't know how your Honor wants to proceed. We can use the alternative version which is marked as Exhibit 584, or we can inquire as to why they will not sign the exhibit.

THE COURT: Mr. Ramos, explain to me how on earth counsel cannot have authority to sign a stipulation in a legal proceeding in federal court.

MR. RAMOS: Because, your Honor, there is a clear --

and I'm stating it for the record -- a clear factual error.

THE COURT: I don't want you to restate for the record. Last Wednesday you had an opportunity to raise these issues, and you yourself sitting in that chair over there said you had no objection to introduction of this joint stipulation, a stipulation that you entered over two months ago --

MR. RAMOS: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Hold on. Mr. Ramos, if I'm speaking, you do not speak. OK? You waived any opportunity to raise an argument. And it was last night at almost 11 p.m. that your cocounsel — having never appeared in this court before — wrote a letter to me changing your position 100 percent. That is not going to happen, and it's not going to fly, and it's not going to be countenanced in this court. All right?

So you can either sign it, because you are counsel in this case and have authority to sign it, and you are stuck with those stipulations, and I don't care if they are true or not at this point, or I will admit the one that is not signed by you. It is your choice.

MR. RAMOS: I'm not going to sign it, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good. Then the other one will be admitted. Let's get the jury.

To be clear, I will also instruct the jury that these are joint stipulations of the parties, that both sides have agreed to them, and they are to treat those facts as true.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Jury present)

THE COURT: Welcome back. I hope you had a pleasant break and a pleasant lunch. As I mentioned before we left, the first stage of the trial is the opening statements by the lawyers. As I mentioned, this is their opportunity to tell you what they expect the evidence in this case will be. Their opening statements -- in fact anything they say throughout the trial -- is not actually evidence, but this is just to give you a preview and sort of context for the evidence that you will hear thereafter.

We will begin with the plaintiff's opening statement and then proceed to the defendants. Just to give you a sense again, tomorrow we will start our regular schedule of 9 to 2:30. Today we are going to go to 5 p.m. and finish a regular day. Then we will take a break at some point this afternoon just to take a break.

with that, I would ask you to give your attention to plaintiff's counsel, Ms. Westcott.

Ms. Westcott, you may proceed.

MS. WESTCOTT: Thank you, your Honor. Good afternoon. My name is Merritt Westcott. I am one of the attorneys for Skyline Steel in this case. With me in the courtroom here today is the president of Skyline Steel, Mr. Laurent DeMey, and my colleagues Mr. Aldo Badini, Mr. Jay Lazar, Mr. Frank They also represent Skyline in this case.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a case about false accusations and the damage those false accusations caused. Here the false accusations were made by the defendant in this case, PilePro, and against products sold by my client Skyline Steel.

Now, the court has already determined that PilePro's accusations were not true, and you will hear how PilePro worked with one of Skyline's biggest competitors, a steel distributor called L.B. Foster, to spread these false accusations and make certain they reached as many potential Skyline customers as possible.

What Skyline will show during this trial is that PilePro made these false accusations in bad faith. You will hear that PilePro's own lawyers told it not to make these accusations. Its own lawyers told PilePro there was no basis for making them. But PilePro decided to ignore its lawyers' advice and made them anyway.

Before I get to the specifics of the accusations, let me back up and tell you a bit about the parties in this case and the products that they sell.

My client, Skyline Steel -- and you should have a slide show up in front of you -- is a United States company; it's headquartered a short distance from here, in Parsippany, New Jersey, and has locations across the United States.

PilePro sells construction solutions to contractors, including

GBT7SKY4

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

what are called sheet piles and sheet pile walls. You likely pass by sheet piling all the time. Sheet pile walls are sometimes used to hold back dirt when someone is digging a building foundation. They can be used to make retaining walls. In this slide one of Skyline's sheet pile walls is being used to form the wall of an underground parking garage in Hicksville, New York, and here it is being used along the Rockaway MTA rail line. Here it is being used as a retaining wall alongside a waterway. If you zoom in, you can see that these walls are made of shaped steel sheets that connect The ends of these sheet piles are especially shaped so they can connect with each other. These shaped ends are sometimes called interlocks.

In some cases where more stability or strength is needed, I-shaped beams, called king piles or large pipes, are also used in the wall and are driven far into the ground along with the sheet piles. In those cases, when the I beams or pipes are used, the wall is commonly referred to as a combi wall because it combines sheet piles with these other products. Here is a picture of a combi wall that includes round pipes and sheet piles. And here is an example of a combi wall that combines the I beams called king piles with sheet piles to increase stability.

Sometimes separate connector products are used in these combi wall to connect these different pieces together.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The products at issue in this case are the ones you just saw. Those that make up Skyline's combi wall called the HZM system.

Skyline sells all of these types of products and is indirectly owned by another U.S. company called Nucor. Nucor makes many different steel products at its steel mills that are located throughout the U.S. by turning scrap metal mostly from scrap automobiles into new steel products. You will hear from Skyline's president, Mr. DeMey, who is also a Nucor executive, that Skyline sells the sheet piling made by Nucor and it also sells sheet piling products made by a company in Europe called ArcelorMIttal. My client Skyline Steel is the plaintiff in this case.

The defendant in this case is PilePro LLC, which is headquartered in Texas. PilePro LLC is a patent holding company, meaning it is a company that owns patents but it does not make or sell any products. PilePro LLC is a group of companies run by Mr. Roberto Wendt, sometimes referred to as the PilePro group. One of the PilePro companies sells steel connectors, as you will see on this slide here, and these connectors are used to connect sheet pile walls together. PilePro's connectors are used with a variety of sheet pile products, including the sheet pile products sold by Skyline's competitors.

Now, all of the lawyers in this case I'm sure appreciate the time and the effort you are going to spend here.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In that regard I wanted to let you know that there is some good news, and the good news is this: A number of things in this case have already been decided either because they have been agreed to by the parties, or because they have already been decided by the court.

Skyline and PilePro have put together a list, something called the joint undisputed statements of law and This list contains things that Skyline and PilePro have agreed to or that the court has already decided, so you don't have to decide the things on this list. The parties have marked this list as Plaintiff's Exhibit 584, and you will get a copy of this list to take back with you to the jury room and to review at the end of the trial.

As I speak to you this morning, and throughout the course of this trial, you may see slides that look like this where we present one of these undisputed statements of law and fact. So, why am I showing you these facts? Because even though you don't have to decide the facts that will show up on this screen, these facts are important to the issues that you will have to decide in this case.

Now on to the specifics of this case. As I said, this is a case about false accusations and statements that PilePro made about Skyline's products. The first false accusation that Skyline would like you to focus on involves a letter that PilePro sent to one of Skyline's customers, a construction

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

contractor named Madonna Construction. In order to explain that letter better, however, I have to give you some background.

Several years ago, in October of 2013, PilePro obtained a U.S. patent. This is a copy of the front page of that patent. As you can see, the patent number there at the top right 8,556,543(b)(2). For purposes of this case though it will mostly be called by its last three digits, the '543 patent.

Right below the patent number you will see the date that the patent issued: October 15, 2013. The issue date is the date the patent becomes effective. PilePro's patent covers a method or a process of making a sheet pile component.

So, PilePro got this patent on October 15, 2013, and you will hear that only days later PilePro started sending letters to Skyline's customers accusing those customers of infringing this patent if they bought or used Skyline's products called the HZM system. I will tell you a bit more about the HZM products in a moment, but one important point here is that the evidence will show that PilePro sent these letters accusing Skyline's products of infringement without any legal opinion that they actually infringed.

You will learn from PilePro's former in-house lawyer as general counsel, Mr. Dwight Williams, that about two weeks after PilePro got this patent, it heard that an order of HZM

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

products was being delivered to Mr. Madonna of Madonna Construction in California. Madonna had already ordered the HZM products from Skyline, and the evidence will show that In fact, PilePro knew it because it found out PilePro knew it. about it from one of Skyline's biggest competitors L.B. Foster. You will hear that L.B. Foster sells a combi wall that directly competes with the HZM system and that combi wall uses PilePro's connectors.

You will hear that PilePro knew that Madonna was considering both the L.B. Foster product and Skyline's product for his project. So, PilePro wanted to send a letter to Madonna accusing the HZM system of infringement. You will hear the videotaped testimony of PilePro's own lawyer Doug Mitchell who works at a lawyer firm called Boies Schiller. Mr. Mitchell will tell you that he is not a patent attorney, that he had not even looked into whether Skyline's HZM products infringed when PilePro wanted to send these letters, and he will tell you that no one else at his firm had looked at it either.

Mr. Mitchell, PilePro's lawyer from Boies Schiller, will tell you that his firm refused to sign a letter accusing Madonna of infringement. Joint undisputed statement of fact 154, Boies Schiller refused to sign the infringement accusation letter sent to John Madonna Construction Company dated November 1, 2013.

So, when PilePro's lawyers refused to sign this letter

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to Madonna, what did PilePro do? Instead of listening to its lawyers' advice, Mr. Wendt, who is the head of PilePro, put the letter on his own letterhead and sent it anyway. And what did Mr. Wendt's letter say? Here is Mr. Wendt's letter. see it's on PilePro's letterhead to Madonna Construction, signed by Mr. Wendt. And PilePro's letter accused Madonna and Skyline of infringement, in other words of selling and using a product made by the patented method. PilePro threatened to

hold Mr. Madonna liable for using the system. But PilePro told

Mr. Madonna that he could avoid this legal problem if he would

have just instead buy the combi wall that included PilePro's connectors. You will learn that Mr. Madonna was very upset about

receiving this letter and that he contacted Skyline asking Skyline to take care of this problem. He wanted Skyline to protect him from any lawsuit by PilePro, in other words to indemnify him, and he also wanted Skyline to pay his legal fees.

Now, here is something that the court has already determined in this case. The court has already determined that when PilePro sent the letter to Madonna on November 1, 2013, accusing Madonna of infringing the '543 patent by virtue of its use of the HZM system, PilePro acted in bad faith, both objectively and subjectively.

The court has already found that the letter sent to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Madonna was sent in bad faith. That is an undisputed statement of law and fact, and you will not be asked to decide that. With regard to this letter to Madonna, you will only be asked to decide if Skyline was damaged and, if so, how much.

Skyline believes that the evidence in this trial will show that it was damaged by this letter, that it did agree to indemnify Madonna, and that it did pay Mr. Madonna's legal fees.

So, I have been talking about an infringement warning letter that PilePro sent to Mr. Madonna, and I would like to shift gears to talk about accusations and statements that PilePro made on its website.

You will hear that PilePro created a website so that engineers designing construction products with sheet piling could look at and could compare a variety of products from different companies, including Skyline's products. website is still up today, and it's called isheetpile.com. fact, you will get to see screenshots from this website during the trial.

This case also involves false accusations and misleading statements that PilePro made on this website about Skyline's products.

First, similar to its letter to Madonna, PilePro posted an accusation on its website that Skyline's HZM products infringed the patent. You will hear that about a week after

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PilePro sent the letter to Madonna, it also decided to post an infringement accusation on every page of the website that showed a product used in the HZM system. Here is what the accusation said. "Warning: This product infringes a U.S. patent owned by PilePro LLC. Click here to view the patent. If you would like more details and to use this patented system, please e-mail info at PilePro.com or call 866-666-7483."

In order for you to understand why Skyline believes that this accusation was false and was made in bad faith, I will have to tell you a bit more as promised about Skyline's HZM system products and PilePro's patent.

As I said, this is a picture of the HZM system as installed. Mr. DeMey, Skyline's president, will explain the system to you in more detail, but as you can see here the system is made of three different products. There are I-shaped king piles shown here in blue. There are sheet piles called AZ sheet piles shown here in green, and there are connectors that connect the two shown, here in yellow. Skyline buys these products from their manufacturer, a company called ArcelorMittal.

Now, in addition to those three products being sold together as the HZM system, each of these three components can be sold separately. For example, the AZ piles are mostly sold by Skyline to make AZ pile walls. This is a picture of an AZ pile wall. You will note it doesn't include the king piles or

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the connectors. If a contractor just wants an AZ pile wall, it doesn't need to buy the other two products. Skyline has been selling the three products of the HZM system together branded as HZM since 2009, but the AZ piles and connectors have been sold by Skyline since the early 2000s.

The infringement accusation that I just read to you, the one that said "Warning this product infringes a U.S. patent owned by PilePro," it was posted on every web page that displayed any product which was a component of the HZM system, including the AZ intermediary pile products and the connector products.

PilePro admits that the website accused the king piles of the HZM system of infringing. PilePro admits that the website accused the AZ intermediary piles of infringing. And PilePro admits that the website accused the HZM connector products of infringing.

Now, Mr. Mitchell, the Boies Schiller lawyer who refused to sign the Madonna letter, he also did not agree with PilePro posting this infringement accusation on the website. You will hear Mr. Mitchell testify that he clearly told PilePro not to post that warning. His firm told PilePro don't do it. In fact, both of PilePro's attorneys, Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Williams, the in-house attorney, will testify that when PilePro decided to post this warning Mr. Mitchell's firm hadn't even begun to investigate whether or not there was any

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

infringement.

So, given that advice from his attorneys, what did PilePro do? Posted the warning anyway. Mr. Wendt, the head of PilePro, posted the warning on the website, and that warning stayed posted for more than two months, and on every page that showed any Skyline product used in the HZM system, and it even stayed posted after Skyline brought this lawsuit.

So, the evidence will show that PilePro ignored its lawyers' advice not once but twice: First, about sending the Madonna letter; second, about posting this infringement warning on the website.

But PilePro didn't just post the warning and leave it at that. You will hear that PilePro told L.B. Foster, one of Skyline's biggest competitors, about the infringement accusation on the website, and L.B. Foster employees will testify that they told numerous potential customers of Skyline's about this accusation, and they would tell them about PilePro's patent. You will hear about how PilePro and L.B. Foster worked together to spread the news of this infringement accusation throughout the industry.

Now, one thing we do know about the accusation against the HZM products is that the accusation was false. Let me repeat that because it's important. PilePro's infringement accusations against the HZM system products was false. court has already determined that none of the HZM system

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

products infringe the '543 patent. The king piles do not 1 2 The AZ intermediary piles do not infringe, and the infringe. 3 connectors do not infringe. Therefore, you don't need to determine whether or not PilePro's infringement accusations 4

were true or false. They were false.

What you do need to determine, however, is whether PilePro posted these accusations on the website in bad faith. We will show that it did.

First, as I already explained, these were posted against the clear advice of their attorneys and before any analysis of infringement had been completed. But not only that, the evidence will show that PilePro knew when it made the accusations that the AZ piles and connectors could not possibly infringe its patent. In other words, PilePro not only was wrong about infringement; it knew that some of the products couldn't infringe. Why do I say that? Let's take a closer look at the patent in this case.

This is the claim of PilePro's patent. I know there are lots of words on this screen, and you will be able to take this claim back to the jury room with you and read it, but I just want to point out two things.

First, this is a patent that covers a method of manufacturing a sheet pile wall component. OK? And this method requires a step of shape-cutting the component. And specifically it requires that the interlock -- you recall the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

slide with the two hands that connected the sheet piles together -- it requires that the interlock be shape cut. don't think you will hear any disagreement that the patent requires that during this trial.

So, the problem is that it is undisputed that the AZ piles and the connectors were not made by shape-cutting. Mr. DeMey will explain, the interlocks of those two components were manufactured by a hot rolling process and had been for years before PilePro got this patent. And significantly you don't even have to take Skyline's view for it. PilePro agrees.

It was common knowledge in the industry that the AZ intermediary pile products are made by hot rolling, and it is common knowledge in the industry that the connector products used with the HZM system are made with hot rolling.

So, PilePro posted its accusations on the website pages, and the pages that include the AZ piles and connectors, knowing that these products weren't shape cut as required by the patent.

Skyline believes that because PilePro knew its allegations were false, and because it posted the accusation against the advice of its own attorneys, and with no opinion that any of the three products infringed, these accusations were posted in bad faith.

Skyline will also show during these trials that these accusations -- which were posted on the website for engineers

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and customers to see -- hurt Skyline's business. You recall this website is designed for engineers who are looking to compare and to select sheet piling products for upcoming construction projects. You will hear that at the time PilePro posted this accusation its website was getting thousands of hits per month.

Mr. David Persampieri, who will appear in the courtroom, and is an expert in the steel industry, will offer an opinion about how this website infringement accusation affected the user's choice of products shown on the website and how it cost Skyline over a million dollars in profits and lost business.

Recall I told you this case dealt with several false or misleading statements on PilePro's website. infringement accusation I told you about was one, but there are two more that Skyline will show during this trial were misleading to users.

One will be referred to as the lead times, and the other as the request-a-quote feature.

You will hear that in the construction business the amount of time it takes between ordering a product and when it gets delivered to the job site is an important factor, and it affects the product selection for a job. Now, keeping that in mind, PilePro's website posted supposed lead times for delivery times for the products that it displays, including Skyline's

products.

Mr. Wendt from PilePro determines what lead times will be posted, and the evidence will show that the lead times posted for Skyline's products are artificially inflated, in other words are made to appear longer than they actually are. Because of this, Skyline has asked PilePro to take the lead times for Skyline's products off its website, but PilePro has refused.

The second website feature you will hear about is something called request-a-quote. Request-a-quote is a button on PilePro's website, and it appears next to Skyline's products on the website. It appears on this button -- which is labeled Request a Quote -- that the user can push the button and request a quote or a price for Skyline's product through the website. But when the user pushes this button, he or she does not get a quote or a price for Skyline's products, and in fact PilePro has never had the authority to sell any of Skyline's products.

So, what happens when the user pushes the Request a Quote button? You will hear on video testimony one of PilePro's former employees, Mr. Gerry McShane, who was in charge of the website. He will testify that when someone used this button, that request came to him at PilePro, and that he was instructed by Mr. Wendt to talk them out of using a Skyline product and into using a competitor product. Actually, he will

GBT7SKY4

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

testify that he would tell them that the Skyline product was not available and that he would try interesting them in something else.

Mr. McShane will testify that he thought this Request a Quote feature was a bait and switch to the users of the website, because the user thought they were going to get pricing or information about a Skyline product, and instead they got steered into buying products from other companies including PilePro. Mr. McShane will tell you he had many disagreements with Mr. Wendt about this feature on the website.

Skyline believes that these two features of the website -- the lead times postings and the Request a Quote feature -- are false or misleading to website users. Skyline wants PilePro to stop listing its lead times and to stop using their Request a Quote feature with Skyline's products.

Over the next few days you will hear from a variety of witnesses, both by live testimony and on video, and you will see a lot of documents. You will hear from Skyline's president, Mr. DeMey. You will also see and hear from its chief financial officer, Ms. Gorog. And you will hear video testimony from one of Skyline's customers, Mr. Madonna, who got the infringement letter from PilePro. You will also hear from Mr. Wendt of PilePro, PilePro's former attorneys Mr. Williams and Mr. Mitchell, and PilePro's former employee Mr. McShane.

Opening - Mr. Ramos

You will also hear from two employers of L.B. Foster, Skyline's competitor, Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Whitworth.

Once you have heard all the testimony, and seen all the documents, we believe that all of this evidence will show, first, that Skyline was damaged when PilePro sent the infringement letter to Madonna in bad faith; two, that PilePro's false infringement accusations against each of the products of the HZM system on its website were made in bad faith because PilePro knew they were false and because it acted directly contrary to the advice of its own lawyers; and, third, we believe the evidence will show that the lead times PilePro posts for Skyline's products are false and misleading, and that the Request a Quote feature misleads users into believing that PilePro's website is a source for Skyline's products.

At the end of all of this evidence we believe one thing will be clear: PilePro, controlled by Mr. Wendt, made false accusations against Skyline's products in bad faith and used its isheetpile website to mislead users, steering them away from buying Skyline's products while promoting its own. Skyline sincerely thanks you in advance for your attention and your service, and submits that at the end of all of this evidence, a verdict in Skyline's favor will be appropriate. Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Westcott.

All right, ladies and gentlemen, I would ask you to

GBT7SKY4

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

give your attention now to defense counsel for the defendant's opening.

MR. RAMOS: Thank you, your Honor.

May it please the court. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. My name is Julio Ramos. I am an attorney for PilePro, the defendant in this action. Over on this table, the defense table, we have Mr. Robert Wendt, the managing partner of PilePro, who is here and will be here during the duration of the trial. We also have Andy Brown, cocounsel in this matter, Darlene Ghavimi, also cocounsel in this matter.

Ladies and gentlemen, this case I feel is very much like a sporting event, a boxing match, so to speak. You have the champ in one corner, Skyline, very well established company, reputable, important to the economy of this nation; it's involved in the steel industry. It impacts our lives daily. Everything that we feel basically is part of the steel process, from automobiles to where we live. It's an important industry. PilePro, it's a 21st century company. It has entered the steel industry in its own unique way. The facts here will show that it has a website, and on this website the consumer of these steel products can access information that relates to the projects and project building, as explained by opposing counsel, all over this country: Damns, bridges, public works projects of all shapes and sizes.

Now, PilePro, they are involved in a little segment of that called the connector business in large measure. They produce connectors. They fabricate connectors, and they do that domestically here in the United States. Their headquarters are in Austin, Texas. Mr. Wendt is the primary person responsible for the management of the company. Now, he is not the only person there. He has other persons that he has delegated various tasks and functions to. And you will hear from some of them during the course of this case. But the real issue here — and I believe that it's fundamental, and the evidence will show — is there are no damages. The evidence in this case with respect to damages is minimal. I would say absent. I would say it doesn't exist in this case.

For instance, as opposing counsel stated, false accusations. False accusations. The court has already decided the issues against us, but the court did not decide the issue of damages. And you have that responsibility to determine that issue about damages.

Now, in this case the evidence will show that the damages amount, or at least alleged by Skyline, is no more than \$5,000 with respect to that Madonna letter that was so prominently displayed in the opening by the plaintiff. And what happened there was that Skyline agreed that it would pay the attorney fees for this particular vendor in the event it was sued in this case. And they had so-called an

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

indemnification agreement to that effect, which from all evidence was only signed by one party: Skyline. Mr. Madonna never signed that letter, that indemnification agreement. never did. In fact, when he was supposedly paid for his attorney fees, there was no issue there, because the contractor had already paid all the costs due on the project. And after that payment had been made is when Skyline made the payment allegedly of a little less than \$5,000 to the attorney for Mr. Madonna and the John Madonna Construction Company.

Now, we argue -- and I think the evidence will show -clearly that those payments were in relation to other disputes, that is to say, other problems that Mr. Madonna had with Because the project that we're talking about, and the Skyline. specifics in this case relate to a project in California sponsored by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. And that's a public process; that's a taxpayer-paying process. process that provides important public benefit to the community.

So, Mr. Madonna had problems with that and wrote e-mails to Skyline saying, you know what, I have a problem with X, and I have a problem with Y and, you know what, I have a problem with these attorney fees because I received this letter from PilePro and I am afraid, or so he says. But the truth of the matter is, ladies and gentlemen, that those \$5,000 -- a little less than \$5,000 that were paid for attorney fees --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

were not a problem associated with the letter from PilePro to the John Madonna Construction Company. They're not. They're not. Those are peripheral. Other issues were in play, and we will show you that evidence.

So I should say, when the plaintiff says false accusations, the accusations in this particular case with respect to John Madonna did not amount to damages to the degree that merits any further consideration with respect to how they, meaning Skyline, presents its case, as it has already in its opening statement said indemnification and attorney fees. But other elements of damages were not discussed because they just simply don't exist in this case.

Now turning to the Internet and the website. Maybe go back a little bit and show what PilePro is about. If I can, cocounsel, if you could put on the screen the brochure from 2015 of PilePro. We will go briefly into the PilePro group. The first page is the PilePro group. That is a marketing brochure that it has there. As you can see, it has statements, and on page 2 it provides an outline of what the company is and how it portrays itself as an innovator. But I think if we go to page 3, it has a table of contents there, and it shows the products at issue by PilePro and what it does and what it does produce and the contributions it makes to this society.

But if we look at page 16 of the brochure, there it specifically identifies the iSheetPile system and the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

iSheetPile search tool that is at issue in this case.

Now, let's be clear, the court did find bad faith with respect to the sending of the letter to the Madonna contractor. The court has never found the damages. That's for you to decide. Now let's distinguish that Madonna case from what is happening here in the iSheetPile allegation.

There has never been determined by this court up to this instance that there was bad faith with respect to the accusations and the print that was placed on the website. court hasn't done that. So with respect to the iSheetPile website you will make that determination both as to bad faith and as to damages.

Now, turning to the iSheetPile website, there is a quick summary that is there on page 16 of the brochure, and it lays out -- and I think it does say in the first paragraph there what the iSheetPile website is. It's a ground breaking on-line tool that compare and configure from hundreds of thousands of sheet pile combinations. That's the first That's the essence of what this marketing tool is paragraph. with respect to PilePro. Skyline doesn't have it. does not like it. Skyline does not like it because it aggregates, it collects all the information that is publicly available for engineers. We're not talking here about let's call it the retail customer from Old Navy, or Amazon book purchases, or Apple iTunes 99 cent purchases. We're not. Yet

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the reason I raise that is because the expert for Skyline that will testify here in this case, he uses that information to make some of his assumptions. The information I'm referring to is online retail sales from Old Navy, online retail sales from Amazon, Barnes & Noble. He has looked at that, and from that he has made statements with respect to a totally different universe of customer, because one of the things that you are going to have to decide is is the sophistication of the customer base here. And by sophistication I mean engineers are the most highly educated people in this nation -- next to lawyers, of course, and doctors. But engineers, they are a specialized group, a specialized breed of individual, and for that they have training and have accumulated knowledge, which is not the regular par-for-the-course knowledge with respect to assuming things and taking them at face value, which is what Skyline is trying to say, that people may have looked at this, or that people have referenced this tool, or have complained about this tool. That evidence I will go no further in that respect, but I will say that you must look at it with the eyes of what an engineer would bring to the table in analyzing the website. What would an engineer say when they are confronted with an infringement warning?

Now, an engineer has a special duty to the public, The engineer knows that what he fabricates and what he produces, and what he authorizes impacts potentially millions

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of people, not rarely or randomly but every day. So think about it.

So, think about it. Would an engineer take an infringement warning and make his decisions on fundamental works projects based on one, one infringement warning, that the evidence will show was only in existence for 66 days before PilePro took it down? And I wish I could say that the 66 days were in the middle of all the commercial activity available during the 2014 to 2013 and 2015 period, when the expert acknowledges that the infringement warning was up on the website, that it was in the let's say busy season of May through June before school gets out. In fact those warnings, the 66 days of warnings, were in the November, December and January period of time, Thanksqiving, Christmas, New Year's, Martin Luther King Day. All of these days the expert doesn't factor into as what the volume of page views are and how many people looked at this, nor does he differentiate between computer programs that visit websites on a daily basis in order to ascertain the content as any website provider would do.

So, what we are facing here in this case are allegations of falsehood on behalf of PilePro, but I must say to say in this case that there were no legal opinions rendered is incorrect, because the evidence will show that Mr. Wendt not only spoke to attorneys here in the United States but spoke to attorneys in Europe as well with respect to this patent, and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that he spoke to a lot -- when I say a lot, I mean more than three or four. I think we're up to five or six from my last count -- he spoke to attorneys with respect to what he could do legally to preserve his '543 patent.

Now, they made a big hay about the fact that an attorney from Boies Schiller refused to sign the letters. fact he did find some letters, but he gave input continuously with respect to the content of those letters. He looked at He blessed those letters, and the evidence will show that based on those communications with their attorney PilePro sent out these letters.

So, when we look at this case, this case is a case of innovation versus tradition. This case is about the 21st Century vis-a-vis the early 20th Century with respect to the marketing of products and the utilization of information, how you use that information and how the marketplace reacts to that information.

Opposing counsel spoke about a couple of issues, and I do want to address them briefly, and that is with respect to we talked about the infringement accusation on the website, but lead times.

Now, lead times, as far as I can gather as a nonengineer, means the date from when an order is placed until it finally gets to its final destination. Now, the evidence will show that there is testimony that lead times at issue in

GBT7SKY4

Opening - Mr. Ramos

this case for this particular product, the HZM product, could range from 12 to 16 weeks. In fact, the evidence will show that the contracts that Skyline utilizes to sell the HZM system states specifically that amount of time, up to 16 weeks. It's in their fine print. It is there for everyone to see.

Now, they come back and they say, well, the lead times on the website are incorrect. But if I look, we'll show you their products manual from 2013 has multiple references to the PilePro website. They knew that PilePro was making assertions of lead times and making assertions with respect to the quotes necessary to fulfill a purchase order, an order that an engineer may have for a particular project.

(Continued on next page)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RAMOS: Because they had worked together beforehand. They had contracts, and they were such engaged in commerce together that at one point in time preceding these accusations and this case, Skyline had the PilePro Web site address affixed prominently in multiple pages of their catalog.

So this case is not about false accusations. This case is about you, the jury, making the findings whether or not Skyline was hurt by what PilePro did. And we will show in this case, with our evidence, with our cross-examination, that there are no damages here and that you will render a verdict in favor of PilePro.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

That's true. That's in the evidence.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Ramos.

All right. We will proceed to the evidentiary portion of the case and --

MR. BANDINI: Your Honor, may we have a sidebar, please?

THE COURT: Not now. We'll take it up at the break. Please call your first witness.

MR. BANDINI: Thank you, your Honor. With respect to the evidence, before our first witness, we would like to offer into evidence as Exhibit 584 a document entitled "Joint Undisputed Statements of Fact And law." We have supplied a copy to the other side, and we'd be pleased to hand one up to

the Court.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. That document is admitted.

(Plaintiff's Exhibit 584 received in evidence)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, a stipulation is sort of a fancy lawyer's term for an agreement between the parties. And the bottom line is these are stipulations, or agreements, between the parties that certain facts or statements are true, and you must regard such agreed facts as true. So Exhibit 584, Plaintiff's Exhibit 584, is in evidence.

Please call your first witness.

MR. BANDINI: Thank you, your Honor. Skyline Steel calls as its first witness Laurent De Mey.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please raise your right hand.

15 LAURENT DE MEY,

called as a witness by the Plaintiff,

having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

THE COURT: You may be seated. Start by spelling your name, please.

THE WITNESS: My name is Laurent De Mey. Spelled L-a-u-r-e-n-t, De Mey, two words, D-e, M-e-y.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

23 BY MR. BANDINI:

- Ο. Good afternoon, Mr. De Mey.
- 25 Good afternoon. Α.

- De Mey Direct
- Who is your employer? 1 Q.
- My employer is Skyline Steel. 2 Α.
- 3 I detect somewhat of an accent. It's very important that
- 4 you speak slowly and clearly so the court reporter here can get
- 5 everything you say and, most importantly, so the jury can
- 6 understand everything you say.
- 7 Sure. Yes. Α.
- 8 Where are you from, Mr. De Mey?
- 9 Yeah, I do have an accent. I'm not from the Deep South.
- 10 I'm from overseas. I'm from Belgium, born and raised in
- 11 Belgium, but became an American citizen recently.
- 12 What is your position at Skyline Steel?
- 13 I'm the president and CEO of the company. Α.
- 14 CEO meaning? Q.
- 15 Α. Chief executive officer. I'm in charge of the company.
- 16 0. I'm sorry?
- 17 I'm in charge of the company. Α.
- What does Skyline Steel do? 18 Q.
- Skyline Steel sells steel that goes vertically in the 19
- 20 ground to support heavy structures. It's called steel
- 21 foundation parts. So we sell big pipe, big beams, sheet piles,
- 22 those things you saw on those pictures before. They all go
- 23 vertically in the ground. They're pushed with big machines to
- 24 support bridges, highways, high-rise buildings, these kinds of
- 25 things.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- We'll get into the details of your business more in just a 1 minute. Can you tell us a little bit about your educational 2 3 background.
 - Α. Yeah. I have a bachelor's degree and a master's degree from the Free University of Brussels in combination with university in Spain as well. So I have a business degree. I'm also a musician. I play a musical instrument. I play the viola, which I both studied in Brussels and in Madrid as well, in Spain. I have a bachelor's degree for that too. And then I kind of studied in several universities afterwards, in business school in Paris, at Duke University, and I'm actually finishing a global executive leadership program at Yale University in Connecticut.
- 14 Very good. If I may, please try to speak slowly.
- 15 Α. Yeah, yeah, yeah. Okay.
- What was your first job after your education? 16 0.
- 17 First started working for a small consultancy firm focused on strategy and overall project management. 18
- What did you do after that? 19 Q.
- 20 So one of those projects I worked for the small consultancy 21 firm was actually advising a newly created company which was 22 called Arcelor, and Arcelor was the merger of a number of steel 23 companies back in Europe. And I started working -- after my 24 stint at this consultancy firm, I started working for Arcelor.

- 1 | Q. What did you do at Arcelor?
- 2 A. I worked in the business development function helping to
- 3 buy companies and build new ventures and open new offices
- 4 around the world.
- Q. What relationship, if any, does Arcelor have to this
- 6 company we've heard about called ArcelorMittal?
- 7 A. So ArcelorMittal, which was created early in the 2002
- 8 | timing, merged into another company called ArcelorMittal back
- 9 | in 2006. And, yeah, I continued working for Arcelor and then
- 10 | ArcelorMittal over time.
- 11 | Q. Okay. So after the merger, you worked for ArcelorMittal?
- 12 | A. Yeah, I continued working for them. And then, of course,
- 13 Arcelor became ArcelorMittal, and I stayed on with the company.
- 14 | Q. When did you first come to work for Skyline Steel?
- 15 | A. So ArcelorMittal was the owner of Skyline Steel until four
- 16 | years ago. So, actually, it's ArcelorMittal who sent me over
- 17 here to work for Skyline.
- 18 | Q. So you were working for Skyline when it was owned by
- 19 | ArcelorMittal?
- 20 | A. Exactly, yes. I came here as being in charge of the
- 21 perations and running the operations we have, yeah.
- 22 | THE COURT: What year was that?
- 23 THE WITNESS: It was in 2009. And year and a half
- 24 | later, I became in charge of the company.
- 25 | Q. When you say you came here, what specific geographic --

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

De Mey - Direct

- 1 A. Yeah, New Jersey. I live in New Jersey.
 - Q. Is Skyline in New Jersey as well?
- A. Yeah, we're based in New Jersey. We have operations across the country.

THE COURT: Hang on one second. Mr. De Mey, in addition to speaking slowly, make sure you wait for Mr. Bandini to finish his question even if you know or have a sense of what the question is going to be. It makes the court reporter's job very hard unless you wait till he's actually done.

THE WITNESS: Understood.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

- 12 | Q. What part of New Jersey is Skyline based in?
- 13 A. In Northern New Jersey, in Morris County.
- 14 | Q. What town?
- 15 A. Parsippany.
- 16 | Q. And does it have a national presence?
- 17 A. Yes. We have, as I said, a number of facilities throughout
 18 the country. We operate in -- we have ten different facilities
- 19 throughout the country. We have a number of sales offices as
- 20 | well, 17 sales offices, and then a number of places where we
- 21 store material throughout the nation to be able to deliver them
- 22 on a quick notice.
- 23 | Q. Does Skyline produce its own products?
- 24 A. We don't produce steel. Steel is produced in a very
- 25 complex, big steel-making facility. We actually process steel.

- 1 So we will buy steel from big steel mills, whether it's
- 2 | ArcelorMittal or Nucor, another company we heard about today,
- 3 or some other ones. I would say most of it is domestic steel
- 4 | bought in the U.S. and produced in the United States. We will
- 5 process that and make it ready for shipment to our customers.
- 6 Q. So when you went to Skyline at ArcelorMittal's request,
- 7 | what was your position there?
- 8 A. I was COO, chief operating officer.
- 9 Q. Did your position change at some point?
- 10 A. Yes. So January 1, 2011, I became president and CEO, chief
- 11 executive officer, of the company.
- 12 | Q. As president, what are your current responsibilities,
- 13 president and CEO?
- 14 A. Yes, it's still my responsibility, yes.
- 15 | Q. What are they? What are your responsibilities as president
- 16 | and CEO?
- 17 A. Right. As I said, I run the company, which means I'm in
- 18 charge of going from human resources to I.T. to sales to
- 19 operations, finance, the whole -- everything. Strategy.
- 20 Everything they do.
- 21 | Q. Do you currently have positions with any other company?
- 22 | A. Yes. I'm also vice president within the Nucor Corporation.
- 23 | They are our mother ship.
- 24 | THE COURT: They are what?
- 25 THE WITNESS: Our mother company. We belong to --

- Skyline is a subsidiary of Nucor, and I'm a VP at Nucor. 1
- 2 Did you say mother ship? Q.
- 3 Yes, I said mother ship. That's the word. Α.
- 4 Just for the benefit of everybody, how do you spell Nucor? Q.
- 5 Α. N-u-c-o-r.
- 6 Okay. What does Nucor do? 0.
- 7 Nucor is a steel company. Yeah, steel company. Α.
- Where is it located? 8 Q.
- 9 It's located, headquarters, in Charlotte, North Carolina.
- 10 Are you familiar, based on your position with them, as to Ο.
- 11 how it produces steel?
- 12 Nucor is a company that produces steel in multiple
- 13 locations in the United States and has introduced multiple
- 14 decades ago a revolutionary way of making steel converting
- 15 scrap -- so your old fridge, washing machine, your old car --
- into steel again and be able to recycle it and make new types 16
- 17 of steel. And Nucor makes all types of steels you can imagine
- 18 based out of scrap that they recycle.
- 19 Is that the traditional way of making steel?
- 20 The old traditional way, which was described before,
- 21 back 100 years ago was -- and there's still some locations
- 22 where that is done -- is you take iron ore. You mine locations
- 23 like Brazil, Australia or the United States or Africa. And you
- 24 use iron ore, something called coking coal, and you put all
- 25 this together in a big blast furnace, so make a lot of

- pollution, and you make liquid steel from that. The old 1 traditional way is called integrated route. What we do is 2 3 called the scrap route, which is a more efficient and much less
- 4 polluting way of making steel.
- Q. A few questions ago -- or a few answers ago, I should say, 5 6 you referred to Nucor as the mother ship. What did you mean by
- 7 that?

11

12

- A. Nucor bought Skyline Steel four years ago, four and a half 8 9 years ago, in 2012 from ArcelorMittal, and we became a
- 10 subsidiary of the Nucor Corporation.
- What kind of steel products does Nucor make?
- 13 outside, you will see some steel somewhere. We probably have a

So it makes everything from a beam. As soon as you walk

- 14 part of that steel. Goes from beam, rebar, flat sheets,
- 15 everything you can imagine that's used in daily consumption,
- 16 veah.
- 17 Q. Does Nucor and Skyline -- I'm sorry, do Nucor and Skyline
- sell the same types of products? 18
- I would say Skyline sells a number of products that Nucor 19
- 20 makes, but Nucor makes many more products that Skyline doesn't
- 21 buy or sell.
- 22 Are you familiar with the concept of a retaining wall?
- 23 Α. Yes.
- 24 Does Skyline sell any products that enable customers to
- 25 make retaining walls?

- Α. Absolutely.
- Can you explain to the jury the concept of a retaining wall 2 Q.
- 3 and have you prepared a demonstrative to aid the jury in
- 4 understanding that?
- Yeah, I think we have a little drawing we got right here. 5
- 6 So we've put on the screen a drawing. Did you -- was this
- 7 prepared at your direction?
- 8 Α. Yeah, yeah.
 - Can you explain to the jury what this shows. Ο.
- 10 Absolutely. So the retaining wall --Α.
- 11 THE COURT: It's not actually on the jury's screen.
- 12 MR. BANDINI: Sorry about that.
- 13 THE COURT: You have to ask to do that. We control
- 14 who sees it.
- 15 MR. BANDINI: Your Honor, this is a demonstrative
- that, my understanding, there's no objection, but they can 16
- 17 speak for themselves.
- 18 THE COURT: They can indeed.
- 19 MS. GHAVIMI: No objection.
- 20 THE COURT: It may be published to the jury.
- 21 MR. BANDINI: I apologize.
- 22 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, just to be clear, as
- 23 I understand it, this is not being offered into evidence; is
- 24 that correct?
- 25 MR. BANDINI: Not into evidence. It's just a

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

demonstrative.

THE COURT: So this is being offered or used as what is known as a demonstrative exhibit. That is just, essentially, to help you understand the witness' testimony. It's not actually evidence in itself. You should consider it just with respect to the testimony, and hopefully it will help you understand that.

Go ahead.

MR. BANDINI: Thank you, your Honor.

- So let me repeat the question, Mr. De Mey. Can you explain to the jury what is shown in this demonstrative that was prepared at your direction.
- So on the top left corner, you see a gentleman A. Yes. standing next to something that we call the retaining wall. So the dark gray vertical piece there is called a retaining wall because it retains the earth from falling into the water. is what a retaining wall is.
- And what have you depicted in the lower left?
- The lower half describes why there could be different types of retaining walls. A retaining wall that only needs to carry the weight of this one gentleman would not be the same type of retaining wall that would be used to carry a full load. you see the truck and the car standing up there, their weight pushes down to the ground and from pushing down will actually put pressure on the retaining wall and possibly fall over into

- 1 the water. So the function of the weight, or the load it's
- 2 called, the function of the load that this wall is retaining,
- 3 you will use different combinations or different types of
- 4 | solutions to get the same results, if you like.
- 5 Q. So in your answer you said there were different types of
- 6 solutions depending on what type of retaining wall?
- 7 A. Exactly.
- 8 | Q. Is that what you have depicted on the right side?
- 9 | A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Hold on, Mr. De Mey. I know the Court will advise you of
- 11 | this if I don't. Please let me finish my question so there's a
- 12 clean record.
- Are the different solutions what you've depicted on
- 14 | the right side of the screen?
- 15 A. Yes, these are different solutions.
- 16 | Q. Please explain those to us.
- 17 | A. So the first one on top you see is called a sheet pile
- 18 | wall. As it continues, wall of sections that we call sheet
- 19 | piles. Once the weight or the load they have to retain from
- 20 | not falling from one side to the other becomes heavier and
- 21 heavier, you need a bigger and a stronger solution. Those
- 22 | sheet piles have different types of solutions. But once they
- 23 get out of their reach, you have to add other piles that are
- 24 stronger. In this case, the second, third are two types of
- 25 combi walls, the third word on the screen.

- 1 Q. When you say combi, that's c-o-m-b-i?
- 2 A. C-o-m-b-i. Combination wall or combi wall.
- 3 | Q. Thank you.
- 4 A. One uses a beam as a king pile. It's called the HZM wall.
- 5 The other one uses a pipe as a king pile. It's called the
- 6 Pipe-Z combi wall. If the loads are even heavier and even
- 7 | stronger, you could in some cases go to something which is
- 8 called an O-Pile wall or a pipe pile wall. So the heavier the
- 9 | load or the function of the load, you will use one or the other
- 10 | variation, variations of combination.
- 11 Q. All right. Thank you, Mr. De Mey. I think we can take
- 12 | that off the screen.
- So one of the walls on that screen and something you
- 14 heard about during opening, since you were sitting here, is the
- 15 | HZM system. You heard that term?
- 16 | A. I did.
- 17 | Q. Is that a system that Skyline sells?
- 18 | A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. Can you tell us what it is.
- 20 A. So as explained before, HZM system is one way of building a
- 21 | retaining wall. And it uses a king pile and special shaped
- 22 | beam, one special type interlock that connects a sheet pile,
- 23 which is the intermediate piece, to another beam. So you have
- 24 beam, interlock, sheet pile, interlock, beam, and so forth.
- 25 | Q. Have you also obtained some demonstrative pictures of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

De Mey - Direct

HZM system to help the jury visualize what we're talking about?

A. Yes.

MR. BANDINI: So I'm putting up D1. With the Court's permission, we would like to display this to the jury.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. RAMOS: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. You may.

BY MR. BANDINI:

- Q. Mr. De Mey, do you see what we've put up on the screen?
- A. Yes, what we see here --
- 11 Q. Hold on. I have to ask you a question. I did ask you a
 12 question, I'm sorry, but you answered it.

What are we seeing here on the screen?

- A. We see a sheet pile being driven in the ground with a variable hammer. The green thing on the top is pushing this sheet pile, intermediate piece of steel, into the ground.

 Between those beams that you see on the right side of the
- picture, you see some pieces of steel are sticking out already. Those are the king piles. They are already in the ground. And that's done in the first phase. In the second phase, the actual intermediate piece, which is this sheet pile here, is being driven between the sheet, sheet piles.
 - MR. BANDINI: If we can display D2, and I would request that we can show that to the jury as well.

THE COURT: Any objection?

- 1 MR. RAMOS: I haven't seen it.
- 2 MS. GHAVIMI: No objection, your Honor.
- 3 BY MR. BANDINI:
- Mr. De Mey, what does this picture show? 4
- 5 This picture shows the same thing except it's finished now.
- So you see the full combined wall finished, HZM solutions in 6
- 7 the ground.
- 8 Is this wall that we're looking at made out of one large
- 9 piece of steel?
- 10 Α. No.
- 11 0. What is it made out of?
- 12 It's made out of multiple components.
- 13 Do those multiple components all look the same? 0.
- 14 Α. No.
- 15 Q. Does Skyline have brochures or manuals that show the
- different shapes of these components? 16
- 17 They do. Α.
- 18 Q. All right. Let me show you what we have premarked as
- Plaintiff's Exhibit 306 and ask you if you recognize this 19
- 20 document.
- 21 Α. I do.
- 22 What is it, for the record? Q.
- 23 It's our Technical Product Manual, edition 2014.
- 24 Did Skyline use this document in the regular course of its
- 25 business?

- Α. Yes, we do.
- 2 How is it used? Q.
- 3 It's being distributed to the -- to our customers, to the
- 4 engineering community, to anybody else who would be involved in
- 5 any type of construction job that needs foundation material to
- 6 support any other structure on top of it.
- 7 MR. BANDINI: At this time plaintiff moves Exhibit 306
- 8 into evidence and asks that it be displayed to the jury.
 - THE COURT: Any objection?
- 10 MR. RAMOS: No objection, your Honor.
- 11 THE COURT: Admitted. You may display it.
- (Plaintiff's Exhibit 306 received in evidence) 12
- 13 MR. BANDINI: Thank you, your Honor.
- 14 Q. Now that we're looking at 306, I guess the cover page is
- 15 being displayed to the jury, what is displayed in that big
- 16 picture in the center of that cover page?
- 17 In the center of the Technical Product Manual you see a
- 18 picture of a construction pit where you see sheet piles are
- 19 being used to retain the side walls and have the workers be
- 20 able to work safely at a level.
- 21 Take a look at the page with the numbers 5916 at the lower
- 22 right. Can you tell us what's shown on that page.
- 23 Yes. That's an HZM solution. Α.
- 24 Is the HZM name a registered trademark?
- 25 Yes, it is. Α.

- 1 Q. Do you know who owns that trademark?
- 2 | A. Yes, I do.
- 3 | Q. Who owns that trademark?
- 4 A. ArcelorMittal.
- 5 | Q. Is Skyline permitted to use that trademark by
- 6 | ArcelorMittal?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 | Q. How do you know that?
- 9 A. It's part of our contract.
- 10 | Q. Looking at this document, do you know whether there's
- 11 | anything in the document that -- Exhibit 306, that is -- that
- 12 references the trademark?
- 13 A. Yes, I know there is.
- 14 | Q. Take a look at the back page. Does the back page of the
- 15 | Technical Product Manual reference the trademark?
- 16 A. Yes, it does.
- 17 | Q. Can you please read that into the record.
- 18 A. It says: HZM and AMLoCor are registered trademarks of
- 19 ArcelorMittal.
- 20 THE COURT: Can I just ask a quick question. On the
- 21 | very bottom of that page, you can see that it says on the left
- 22 | "confidential," and then on the right there's a letter and
- 23 | number combination that ends in 5964. I assume those were not
- 24 on the original version of the document; is that correct?
- THE WITNESS: No, your Honor.

GBTHSKY5

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, let me just explain, you'll see on some documents -- well, you see on this one, and I imagine you'll see on other documents, markings like that. Those are markings that are put on papers, on documents, as part of the litigation process. They're essentially known as Bates stamps. It just allows the parties in a case like this to keep track of documents that have been exchanged and make sure everybody's literally on the same page when it comes to referring to documents.

So you'll see that, you. Should basically ignore those markings, as well as the statement that says "confidential." That allows parties to exchange things that, at least in advance of trial, can be kept sort of confidential and just between them. It's just a legal -- part of the process, and you shouldn't consider it with respect to either -- any of the decisions you have to make or hold it against either side.

Okay. You may proceed.

MR. BANDINI: Thank you, your Honor.

- When did Skyline start selling the HZM system? 0.
- It's a while ago. Ten --Α.
- Q. Approximately?
- 23 Ten years ago. Ten, 15 years ago, I think. Α.
- 24 Ο. HZM?
 - As soon as HZM became available, we started selling Α. HZM.

- 1 || it.
- 2 Q. Okay. Does Skyline have competitors that sell sheet pile
- 3 | walls?
- 4 | A. Yes, sir.
- 5 Q. Do any of them refer to their walls as HZM walls?
- 6 A. No, they don't.
- 7 Q. How about the Skyline name? Are you aware of any other
- 8 sheet piling company in the U.S. that goes by Skyline?
- 9 | A. No.
- 10 Q. Now, staying with 306, I believe I wanted to ask you
- 11 something.
- 12 Michael, I'm sorry, can you go back to page 5916.
- 13 When you said that this was the HZM system, I wanted
- 14 you to take us through the components. Can you explain what
- 15 | those components are.
- 16 A. Yeah.
- 17 | Q. So now we've highlighted something in blue. What is that?
- 18 A. The blue is what we call the king pile.
- 19 Q. Did you say king pile?
- 20 A. King pile, yes.
- 21 | Q. Okay.
- 22 | THE COURT: Just for the record, the blue is the sort
- of I-shaped items on the left and the right of the diagram; is
- 24 | that correct?
- 25 THE WITNESS: Yes.

- 1 THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
- Now we've highlighted some things in yellow. What are 2 3 those?
- Those are called connectors. They connect or they make it 4 Α.

possible for the sheet pile to connect to that I-shaped beam.

- 6 Okay. Now let's highlight the next piece. We've
- 7 highlighted something in green. What is that?
- That's called intermediate sheet pile, or an AZ sheet pile 8
- 9 in this case.

- 10 Q. For the record, what is the shape of what we just
- 11 highlighted in green?
- 12 This is called an AZ sheet pile. It's produced by
- 13 ArcelorMittal.
- 14 And it's sort of a --Q.
- It's like a Z shape, yeah. 15 Α.
- Now, is the HZM system the first combi wall system that 16
- 17 used beams and sheet piles sold by Skyline?
- 18 Α. No.
- 19 What did you sell before the HZM system? Q.
- 20 Before it was simply called HZ system. Α.
- 21 So no "M." It was just "H" and "Z"? Q.
- 22 Α. No "M."
- 23 What is the HZ system? 0.
- 24 It's a very similar product except the beam is slightly
- 25 different.

- 1 When you say "the beam," was that I-shaped --
- Yeah, I -- we call it the beam. The I-shaped piece of 2 Α.
- 3 steel was slightly different.
- Q. All right. Let's put in front of you Plaintiff's 4
- 5 Exhibit 308, which is a document. Can you identify it for the 6 record.
- 7 That's a document which is called HZ Steel Wall A. Yes.
- System, edition 2000- -- that's not very visible -- I think '3 8
- 9 or '1. And it's from a company called Profil ARBED.
- 10 Q. Was this a document that was used in the ordinary course of
- 11 business to sell the HZ wall system?
- 12 A. Yes.

- 13 MR. BANDINI: At this point plaintiffs would move to admit Exhibit 308 and publish it to the jury.
- 15 Any objection? THE COURT:
- Objection, your Honor. 16 MR. RAMOS:
- 17 THE COURT: Basis?
- 18 MR. RAMOS: Your Honor --
- 19 THE COURT: Just one-word basis.
- 20 MR. RAMOS: Foundation.
- 21 THE COURT: All right. Sustained.
- 22 Mr. Bandini, why don't you lay a little bit more of a
- 23 foundation.
- 24 BY MR. BANDINI:
- 25 Mr. De Mey, was this a document that was used by Skyline to

- sell the HZ steel wall system? 1
- 2 Α. Yes.
- 3 How was it used? 0.
- 4 Same principle. It's used as a document that explains the Α.
- 5 product solution that's used and distributed to technical
- 6 people, engineers, customers. Same principle.
- 7 MR. BANDINI: Same motion, your Honor.
- 8 THE COURT: Any objection?
- 9 MR. RAMOS: Same objection. Lacks foundation.
- 10 THE COURT: Overruled. It's admitted.
- 11 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 308 received in evidence)
- MR. BANDINI: Thank you, your Honor. May we publish 12
- 13 it to the jury?
- 14 THE COURT: You may.
- BY MR. BANDINI: 15
- 16 Take a look at the front page, Mr. De Mey.
- 17 Α. Yes.
- 18 There is a picture and then on top of the picture there's
- 19 something that looks like a drawing. Do you see that?
- 20 Α. Yep.
- 21 What does that drawing show? Q.
- 22 It shows a zoomed-in picture of what we described before a
- 23 little bit with a sheet pile on top, the interlock special
- 24 shaped steel, and the lower part is a fraction of the king
- 25 pile, or the I-beam.

- De Mey Direct
- 1 Now, do you see at the upper left of the front page it says "edition 2001"? 2
- 3 I see that, yes.
- Did Skyline sell this HZ steel wall system in the United 4
- 5 States in 2001?
- 6 Α. Yes.

- Does Skyline still sell that system?
- 8 Α. Not anymore.
- 9 Why is that? Q.
- 10 Because today it's called the HZM system.
- 11 Okay. Now, if you stay with that document, let's look at
- 12 the picture on page 6002 on the bottom -- actually, it's on the
- 13 center, the right-hand side of the page, which I think is up on
- 14 the screen now.
- Can you tell us what that shows. 15
- It's the same thing. It's -- actually should see it now in 16
- 17 the actual product, in steel. On the left-hand side, you see
- 18 the intermediate sheet pile. The middle strange-shaped element
- 19 is the interlock, or the connector. And on the right-hand
- 20 side, you see a part of the king pile, or the I-beam.
- 21 The king pile, or I-beam, is the part on the right side of
- 22 the picture; is that right?
- 23 Α. Yes.
- 24 Is that the part that was different in the HZM system?
- 25 Yes, that changed. Α. Yes.

- De Mey Direct
- 1 Now, in the course of your work for Skyline, have you seen
- 2 any drawings of what the new HZM king pile looks like?
- 3 Yes. Α.

- All right. Let me show you what we've premarked as 4 Q.
- 5 Plaintiff's Exhibit 20 and direct you to figure 7 of that
- document. Can you identify what that drawing depicts. 6
 - That is the -- yes, I can.
- What does it depict? 8 Q.
- 9 That is the king pile of the HZM solution with, on the Α. 10 right-hand side, one connector added to it.
- 11 So that's the new type of king pile that you sell?
- 12 Α. Yes, it is.
- 13 0. As for the document as a whole, can you identify the document for the record. 14
- 15 THE COURT: Why don't you go to the first --
- 16 MR. BANDINI: I'm sorry.
- 17 MR. RAMOS: Objection. Ambiguous.
- 18 MR. BANDINI: I'll rephrase the question.
- 19 Have you seen this document before? Q.
- 20 Α. Yes, I have.
- 21 What is it? Q.
- 22 Α. It's a U.S. patent.
- 23 Have you seen it before this case? 0.
- I got involved, and I saw it since the case. 24 Α.
- 25 Have you had occasion to discuss this patent with anyone at Q.

- 1 | ArcelorMittal?
- 2 | A. Yes.

- 3 | Q. In what regard?
- 4 A. Linked to this case.
 - Q. I'm sorry?
- 6 A. Linked to this case. Since this case began.
- 7 MR. BANDINI: Okay. Move to admit Exhibit 20.
- 8 MS. GHAVIMI: Objection. Foundation and relevance.
- 9 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 10 MR. BANDINI: All right. Let's turn to -- let's put
- 11 | that aside for a second. Let's turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.
- 12 | Q. Do you recognize this document?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. What is it?
- 15 A. It's a brochure about the HZM steel wall system, edition
- 16 2013.
- 17 Q. Is this a document that Skyline keeps and distributes in
- 18 | the ordinary course of its business?
- 19 | A. It did.
- 20 | Q. I should rephrase. Did Skyline keep and distribute this
- 21 document on or about the year 2013 in the ordinary course of
- 22 | its business?
- 23 | A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Are the products indicated in this brochure the products
- 25 | that Skyline was selling in 2013?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

24

25

Α. Yes.

> MR. BANDINI: Move to admit and publish Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.

> > THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. GHAVIMI: No objection.

THE COURT: Admitted.

(Plaintiff's Exhibit 11 received in evidence)

BY MR. BANDINI:

- Q. Now, Mr. De Mey, can you look at the cover page of Plaintiff's Exhibit 11 and tell us what that shows. And in particular, I know there's a picture. What does that drawing on top of the picture depict?
- A. So the drawing on top is again the same thing, except this time it describes HZM solution. So it shows the king pile beam on top, then the connector, and then the sheet pile on the lower half.
- Q. Again, if you could remind us of what was different between this and the HZ system.
- A. So the difference here is the king pile has a slightly different shape in the HZM system compared to the HZ system.
- 21 Q. What's the difference, if you could describe it in the 22 shape?
 - A. The difference is that there would be an accumulation of steel towards the end of the sides of the beam in the old system, and here, it's done slightly differently.

- Now take a look at page 88 of that document. And there's a 1
- picture on the lower right which we'll blow up for you. 2
- 3 does that depict?
- It shows the king pile of the HZM system with two 4
- 5 interlocks, two connectors.
- 6 Is that the king pile design that Skyline has been Okav.
- 7 selling as part of the HZM system?
- 8 Α. Yes.
- 9 I asked you to take a look at figure 7 of Exhibit 20 which
- 10 you directed me to earlier. Have you ever compared the HZM
- 11 sold by Skyline with the one depicted on figure 7 of
- 12 Exhibit 20?
- 13 A. Can you repeat the question. Make sure I understand it
- 14 right.
- 15 O. Sure. Sure. We just looked at the catalog picture of
- Exhibit 11, and I think you just told me that page 88 showed 16
- 17 the HZ king pile sold by Skyline?
- 18 Α. Uh-huh.
- 19 Is that correct? Q.
- 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 That's right on the screen. Have you ever compared that Q.
- 22 with the picture shown in figure 7 of Exhibit 20?
- 23 Yeah, yeah. Okay. Α. Yes.
- 24 Ο. We could put it on the witness --
- 25 That would probably be easier. Α.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

De Mey - Direct

MS. GHAVIMI: Objection, your Honor. Lacks foundation and knowledge of the document, Exhibit 20.

THE COURT: You're objecting to the question?

MS. GHAVIMI: Eliciting testimony about Exhibit 20.

THE COURT: Just yes or no.

MS. GHAVIMI: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Sustained.

MR. BANDINI: All right. I'll move on.

Q. Let's take a look at the other components of the HZ system, the older system. Staying with 308, back to Exhibit 308, let's look at page 5986 of that catalog. And if we could -- this is in evidence, I believe. If you could look at that page, we've blown up the pictures to make them easier to see.

What is depicted on the top part of that page?

- That is called an AZ intermediate sheet pile. Α.
- What is depicted on the bottom of the page? 0.
- 17 These are three types of connectors.
- 18 Now, these, of the piles and the connectors, were sold with
- 19 the old system; correct?
- 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 How do these products, the AZ intermediary piles and the
- 22 connectors sold with the old HZ system, differ, if at all, from
- 23 the AZ piles and connectors sold with the new HZM system?
- 24 MR. RAMOS: Objection, your Honor.
- 25 THE COURT: Overruled.

- 1 Not at all. No change.
 - Not at all. Q.
- 3 And how long has Skyline been selling these AZ piles
- 4 and connectors in this form?
- As long as they've been made. 5
- Okay. Now, you should have in front of you an envelope. 6 0.
- 7 Α. Yes.

- I believe if you look inside, can you tell us what's inside 8
- 9 the envelope.
- 10 Α. I can.
- 11 What is inside the envelope?
- 12 These are small plastic examples of what a sheet pile combi
- 13 wall could look like.
- 14 Q. Do you --
- THE COURT: 15 Just leave them there for now, please.
- Leave them down for a second. 16 0.
- 17 Where did you obtain them from?
- We received those from ArcelorMittal. 18 Α.
- 19 When? Q.
- 20 Probably 15 years ago. Α.
- 21 Fifteen years ago? Q.
- 22 Α. Fifteen years ago, yeah.
- 23 So those were not created for purposes of this case? 0.
- 24 Α. No, no, not at all.
- 25 When you say we received them from ArcelorMittal, you mean

Skyline?

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Yes, Skyline, yeah. Α.
- 3 So were they at Skyline's offices? 0.
 - Yes, they were. Α.
 - What are they used for, if anything?
 - Well, so we have those little plastic examples to show to Α. customers or engineering firms or universities to show or make it visible, really tangible, what we really make or what we sell.

MR. BANDINI: Your Honor, at this point I would offer the witness' testimony with respect to these models to demonstrate how the system works, subject to any objection.

THE COURT: Meaning you want to use the models as a demonstrative or you're offering the models an as exhibit?

MR. BANDINI: I want to use the models as a demonstrative.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. GHAVIMI: No objection.

THE COURT: All right. You may proceed.

MR. BANDINI: So I'm not sure what's the simplest, your Honor, whether he can put them on the shelf next to the witness stand or whether he should perch on this bar. Whatever the Court prefers.

THE COURT: I'm going to go with the witness stand bar, and hopefully jurors can see.

2

3

8

9

And jurors at the end of the first row, if you want to move around closer, you're welcome to, but I would hope that

- BY MR. BANDINI: 4
- Q. All right. So my question, sir, first is if you could take 5 6 us through the individual pieces of the model and what they 7 are, and then we'll move on from there.
 - Yes, I can. So do I start?

you could see from there anyway.

- Yes, you may start. Q.
- 10 This, as you've seen, is called a beam. That's the king 11 pile, these elements. They go vertically in the ground like
- 12 this, as you saw in the picture, one by one by one, advance. 13 Q. Hold on. Let me stop you right there. When they're in
- 14 real life, are they that long or longer?
- No. These could be up to over 100 feet long. 15 Α.
- One hundred feet long into the ground? 16 0.
- 17 Α. Yes.
- 18 THE COURT: These are the sort of I-shaped --
- 19 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 20 THE COURT: -- objects?
- 21 THE WITNESS: Yeah.
- 22 THE COURT: And they go into the ground?
- 23 THE WITNESS: And they go vertically like this.
- 24 imagine one long piece of -- of beam like 100 foot long,
- 25 60 feet long, 70 feet long.

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: But if you were looking at them from the sky, they would essentially appear to be a letter "I"; is that

3 a fair statement?

> THE WITNESS: If you look up, you would see an "I," yes.

> > THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

BY MR. BANDINI:

- What are the other pieces?
- A. So as you see here, we have something on here which is called a connector, which is a piece of steel which has the same length as a sheet pile, not necessarily as the beam, but as the sheet pile, which will be attached also vertically in there like this. Okay. As you see, it's the same special shape that is attached in the factory in Luxembourg. It's slid in there and then attached by a small welding at notable points.

THE COURT: That's just a small connecting piece --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: You need to wait for me to finish.

THE WITNESS: Sorry.

MR. BANDINI: It's very bad to interrupt the judge, which I just did.

THE COURT: Bad to interrupt anyone because it makes that woman's job too difficult. But it's a little different than speaking in the normal world.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, the connector just slides onto this sort of end of the top and the bottom of the "I," if you will, the ends of those pieces; is that a fair statement?

THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: So here I have an example here of two beams, all right, to make it simple. Each side gets one of those connectors, okay. Now, multiple beams will be driven in the ground vertically. Here, one next to the other, but not exactly next to the other because you need enough room to put an intermediate sheet pile, which I'll show in a second.

We'll put multiple of those elements as long as your wall is long. Then you need to add something like this, which is a sheet pile. A sheet pile is -- as Mr. Bandini said, it's a Z-shaped piece of steel, okay. It has something very specific at the ends, both ends, that's called the interlock. That is specific enough that it actually can go into each other like this and create a pair of sheet piles. Those elements as well are 50, 60, 70, 80 feet long.

So they go vertically like this in here, and then they will perfectly fit into this one element, which is not as easy, and the other one. We've now created an HZ solution.

THE COURT: All right. So you slide those into the connectors, thereby connecting the two I-beam --

THE WITNESS: Yes.

3

4

5

7

8

THE COURT: -- king piles, yes?

2 THE WITNESS: Exactly.

THE COURT: All right.

THE WITNESS: This is on a continuous way. So first beams are driven and then the sheet piles are driven all along.

BY MR. BANDINI: 6

- So with that thing you've just created -- can you hold it up again, would that be called the combi wall?
- 9 Yes, that is a combi wall. Α.
- 10 Okay. Why is it called a combi wall? Ο.
- 11 Because it's combines multiple elements, combines I-beam 12 and a sheet pile connected with those connectors.
- 13 Ο. Now, can engineers or contractors use just the AZ 14 intermediary piles to make a wall?
- 15 Α. Absolutely.
- 16 Can you show us how that's done.
- 17 So we have this one pair of sheet piles you can 18 drive in the ground, and you can drive another pair of sheet 19 piles in the ground, and so on and so on, as long as you need
- 20 be.
- 21 Can you hold that up so everybody can see. Q.
- 22 Would that be called a combi wall?
- 23 No, that's not a combi wall. Α.
- 24 That's an AZ wall? Ο.
- 25 That's an AZ wall. Α.

- 1 Do you have -- you could put those down for now.
- 2 have any demonstrative pictures of a wall that's just an AZ
- 3 wall?
- A. Yes, we do. 4
- 5 Q. Can we put in front of you what we've labeled D4 and ask
- you to look at that. What is this? 6
- 7 This is an AZ sheet pile wall, continuous wall.
- 8 MR. BANDINI: Right. I'd ask that this be published 9 to the jury as a demonstrative.
- 10 THE COURT: Any objection?
- 11 MS. GHAVIMI: No objection.
- 12 THE COURT: Granted.
- 13 BY MR. BANDINI:
- 14 So how does this correspond to what you were just showing
- in the models? Which of the models does this correspond to? 15
- 16 It is exactly the same as this.
- 17 As that AZ? Ο.
- 18 Α. Yes.
- 19 So did Skyline sell these AZ piles to make these walls
- 20 before the HZM system came along?
- 21 Α. Yes.
- 22 Q. Now, in what instances, based on your experience, would an
- 23 engineer choose this type of wall instead of the HZM wall?
- 24 MR. RAMOS: Objection.
- 25 THE COURT: Overruled.

- 1 So I think as we explained in the first page, very first
- image we showed, a function of the load that the wall needs to 2
- 3 carry, or the weight that it needs to carry, we will use only
- 4 an AZ wall or go into the combi wall when the loads are
- 5 heavier. Combi wall means including beams and piles.
- 6 Q. As president of Skyline, are you aware of how much this
- 7 type of wall Skyline sells compared to how much of the combi
- HZM wall it sells? 8
- 9 MR. RAMOS: Objection.
- 10 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 11 About ten times more.
- 12 Ten times more of what?
- 13 Of AZ sheet piles just alone as one wall compared to combi Α.
- 14 walls.
- It sells ten times more of these AZ walls? 15 Q.
- 16 Yes, ten times more of this compared to solution HZM. Α.
- 17 How long has that been true? Ο.
- 18 Forever. Since this company has been in business. Α.
- 19 Do you know approximately how many dollars in sales Skyline
- 20 made of the AZ pile walls without the HZM system for the years
- 21 2013, '14, and '15?
- 22 It's between 100- and \$150 million per year in sales.
- 23 Now, are you familiar with how these AZ piles are made? 0.
- 24 Α. Yes.
- 25 How are you familiar with that? Q.

- 1 I have seen it with my own eyes.
- 2 You've seen them made? Q.
- 3 Yes, I've seen them made, yeah. Α.
- Where have you seen them made? 4 Q.
- In Luxembourg, in the steel mill where it's being made. 5 Α.
 - Have you prepared for the jury a demonstrative 0.
- 7 demonstrating how they are made?
- 8 Α. Yes.

- 9 Let's put in front of you what we marked as D5 and ask you
- 10 if that is the demonstrative you're referring to?
- 11 Yes, it is.
- 12 MR. BANDINI: Permission to publish this demonstrative
- 13 to the jury?
- 14 THE COURT: Any objection?
- MS. GHAVIMI: No objection. 15
- 16 THE COURT: All right. You may.
- 17 BY MR. BANDINI:
- 18 Q. So I notice -- before we get into the specifics of this, I
- 19 notice the title says "Manufacturing by Hot-Rolling." Do you
- 20 see that?
- 21 Yes. Α.
- 22 What is hot-rolling? Q.
- 23 Hot-rolling means that the shape of the end product is
- 24 obtained when the steel is almost at the liquid stage, so above
- 25 1,000 degrees.

Q.

1

De Mey - Direct

The steel is at a thousand degrees?

- 2 The steel is at a thousand degrees, yes. Α.
- 3 Now, can you take us through what you show in this
- 4 demonstrative to explain how hot-rolling is used to make the AZ
- 5 sheet piles.
- 6 So there's something called a steel blank on this
- 7 It looks like a beam. It's not exactly a beam. picture.
- a semifinished product. So from liquid steel you will make a 8
- 9 beam blank, or a steel blank, which is cooled down and
- 10 afterwards reheated at around a thousand degrees,
- 11 approximately, and then passed through a number of passes,
- 12 which are big sets of rolls. So the steel will roll through
- 13 these rolls, and these rolls come closer and closer and have a
- 14 more specific shape, more special shape. And every different
- 15 roll that it goes through is called a pass. And after a number
- of passes, you end up with a product called the AZ sheet pile. 16
- 17 And here you see the stage-by-stage evolving, probably till it
- 18 goes to that final shape.
- 19 Are these AZ sheet piles shape cut at all?
- 20 Not at all. Α.
- 21 How about the connectors that are used with the HZM system?
- 22 Are you familiar with how they are manufactured?
- 23 Α. Yes, I am.
- 24 Ο. Are those shape cut at all?
- 25 Α. No.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

De Mey - Direct

1 THE COURT: How are they manufactured?

THE WITNESS: There's two ways of making it. One is rolling very similar to this.

- Hot-rolled. Q.
- Hot-rolled. And the other one is extrusion, which is a different process.

THE COURT: What does "shape cut" mean?

THE WITNESS: "Shape cut" means that you cut it with a grinder, grinding machine, to create the shape. It's not what's done here.

THE COURT: All right.

- Again, so since you were here for the openings, you heard reference to a company that was called L.B. Foster. Have you ever heard of that company before?
- Yes, I have. 15 Α.
- What is L.B. Foster? 16 0.
- 17 L.B. Foster is a competitor of ours.
- 18 A competitors of yours? Q.
- 19 They compete with us. Α. Yes.
- 20 Have you prepared a demonstrative showing the steel
- 21 industry and competition, as you understand it, in the
- 22 industry?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 So let's show D6 to you, the first page, and ask you if
- 25 this was prepared at your direction. Was this prepared at your

- direction? 1
- 2 Α. Yes, it was. Sorry.
- 3 Does this purport to show the competitors at your level in
- the steel industry? 4
- 5 Α. It does.
- 6 MR. BANDINI: I move to display this and the remaining 7 ones in this series to the jury as a demonstrative.
 - THE COURT: Any objection?
- 9 Yes, I do object, your Honor. MR. RAMOS:
- 10 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 11 MR. BANDINI: All right. We'll just talk through it.
- 12 Who manufactures -- let me back up.
- 13 Skyline competes with L.B. Foster; correct?
- 14 Α. Yes.

- In what sense? What does L.B. Foster do? 15 Q.
- L.B. Foster sells and distributes steel foundation 16
- 17 products.
- 18 Q. Are there any other companies besides Skyline and L.B.
- Foster that distribute and sell steel foundation parts? 19
- 20 There's a wide number of them, yeah. Yes.
- 21 I'm sorry? Q.
- 22 There's a large number of people competing with us, yes.
- 23 Okay. All right. Let's go above the level, the
- 24 distributor level. Where does Skyline get the HZM product to
- 25 distribute?

- 1 Skyline buys its steel products from companies like ArcelorMittal like we talked before, like Nucor like we 2
- 3 discussed before, and other steel mills.
- 4 THE COURT: Counsel, can you take the slides down, 5 please.
- 6 MR. BANDINI: Sure. Take the slides down.
- 7 THE COURT: Thank you.
- Q. You said it buys -- I'm sorry. I had a problem hearing 8
- 9 you. You say Skyline buys from ArcelorMittal?
- 10 Α. Yes.
- 11 We talked about them before. And where are they located?
- They're located around the world, but we buy the product 12
- 13 from Luxembourg.
- 14 Q. Luxembourg.
- 15 And where else did you say Skyline buys product from?
- 16 From Nucor. Α.
- 17 Okay. What about your competitors? Let's take L.B.
- 18 Foster. Do you know where L.B. Foster obtains its products?
- 19 Α. Yes.
- 20 Where do they obtain its products from? 0.
- 21 They buy products from a company called Gerdau. Α.
- 22 Can you spell that, please. Q.
- 23 Α. G-e-r-d-a-u.
- 24 G-e-r-d-a-u? Ο.
- 25 Α. Yes.

- What is Gerdau? 1 Q.
- Gerdau is a Brazilian steel company with operations also in 2 Α.
- 3 the United States, and they buy from them, from Gerdau.
- So what type of company is Gerdau? Is it a distributor? 4 Q.
- No, it's a steel company. 5
- It's a steel company like -- like ArcelorMittal? 6 0.
- 7 Like ArcelorMittal. Α.
- Like Nucor? 8 Q.
- 9 Α. Like Nucor.
- 10 Okay. So there are steel companies and then there are 0.
- 11 distributors?
- 12 Α. Yes.
- 13 Skyline's a distributor? 0.
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Now, we heard about PilePro. Where does PilePro fit in
- this market, if you know? 16
- A. PilePro supplies companies like L.B. Foster and its 17
- 18 competitors.
- 19 And what does, to your knowledge, PilePro supply?
- 20 Mainly connectors. Α.
- Connectors? 21 Q.
- 22 Α. Yes.
- 23 Now, we've talked about the steel mills, the distributors,
- 24 PilePro. Who does Skyline sell to? Who are your customers?
- 25 Our customers are contractors.

- Contractors as in construction project contractors?
 - Construction contractors, general contractors, Α.
- 3 subcontractors.
- 4 In terms of who Skyline directs its business efforts to, Ο. 5 were there any particular types of individuals that you sell
- 6 to?

- 7 We sell mainly to -- well, put it differently, our A. Yeah.
- product is being used in big foundation projects. So these are 8
- 9 projects that the Department of Transportation wants to build,
- 10 like a new bridge or a new highway, or somebody who owns a port
- 11 and wants to build a new cay terminal for container vessels.
- 12 And we sell to the contractors that will -- that were the low
- 13 bidder for those jobs. And so they need steel at some point,
- 14 and we will sell to those contractors.
- What I'm getting at, you heard Mr. Ramos talk about highly 15 Ο.
- educated people. You heard him talk about doctors and lawyers 16
- 17 and engineers. Does Skyline market to doctors and lawyers?
- 18 We do not sell to any doctor or any lawyer. Α.
- 19 So you market to engineers; is that correct? Q.
- 20 Yeah, we sell to engineers and we -- yep. Α.
- 21 Over the course of your job career, have you ever had
- 22 discussions with engineers about what factors they consider
- 23 important in deciding what combi wall system to buy?
- 24 Α. Absolutely, yes.
- 25 All right. We're actually going to take a THE COURT:

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

break there.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's 2:57. I wanted to give everybody a break, since otherwise it will be a long afternoon. Why don't you go to the jury room -- you can stretch your legs, use the facilities -- and be ready to go in, let's say, ten minutes.

Couple reminders that you will hear me say over and over throughout the case. Number one, do not discuss the case. You have heard only a little bit of the evidence, and, again, you should not discuss the case with each other or anyone else, for that matter until -- well, you shouldn't discuss it with each other until your deliberations begin, and you shouldn't discuss it with anyone else until after you have been discharged as jurors. So do not discuss the case. Do not communicate about the case in any way, shape, or form. And not that you could in the jury room, but don't do any research about the case either. And, finally, keep an open mind.

With that, please be ready to go in ten minutes, and enjoy your break. Thank you.

(Jury excused)

(Continued on next page)

22

23

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(In open court)

THE COURT: You may be seated.

Mr. De Mey, you may step down.

Now, two quick sort of housekeeping-ish or logistics things. One is I prefer that only one lawyer make objections. So whichever lawyer is going to conduct the cross-examination, that lawyer should make objections and only that lawyer should make objections.

You can go around to your seat, Mr. De Mey.

Number two, since there's no objection, and I assume both sides are going to use them, I don't have an objection in principle to use of demonstratives. I tend to be of the view that it's better to actually admit exhibits, but in any event, I certainly want the record to be clear as to what is being used. So I think that you may have referred to these as D and then a number. I hope, and assume, that that sort of system will continue throughout the case. I just want a record made as to what you're showing so that for purposes of appeal, or otherwise, it's apparent what's been shown. So just keep that in mind going forward.

With that, Mr. Bandini had wanted to raise an issue at sidebar. You want to raise that now or should we talk about it later?

> MR. BANDINI: I can raise that now, your Honor. (Continued on next page)

MR. BADINI: I can raise that now, your Honor. While we are on the issue of demonstratives though, I was a little surprised by the objection to the corporate relationships, because we met and conferred last night, and we were told there was no objection. In any event, I walked through it.

THE COURT: All right. I didn't think it was really necessary in the sense that it wasn't technical testimony, didn't really seem necessary to aid the jury in understanding the testimony. That was why I ruled as I did. Had I been told there was agreement to use them, I might have ruled differently. If you want to flag that in advance going forward, you are welcome to do so, and then it might make things go a little guicker.

MR. BADINI: Sure. But the more serious objection -and I am of the view that I try not to object to openings while
they're happening -- but I believe that Mr. Ramos, whether
intentionally or not -- and I don't assume any ill will on his
part -- I believe walked over the line in a couple of instances
in violation of this court's order relating to spoliation in
this regard. The court at docket 299, as you know, precluded
PilePro from arguing that, one --

THE COURT: I know the ruling. Tell me where you think it crossed the line.

MR. BADINI: Sure. The ruling has two significant parts. One is --

THE COURT: Again, I know the ruling. Tell me where you think it crossed the line.

MR. BADINI: OK. One, he questioned whether engineers would have made their decision — or changed their decision — based on the infringement warning, and the ruling of course says questioning the effect. And, two, with respect to the volume of people or the number of people, he made an argument relating to the Thanksgiving and Christmas period, and the implication, as I took away from it, was how could many people have been viewing it during that time period, which I believe also crossed the line.

I am sorry. One more point. There was a reference to how people were directed to the PilePro website in Skyline's marketing materials, which I took as a suggestion that we were implicitly encouraging people to see the lead times.

That reference, which was earlier on, was put on the Skyline marketing materials as part of the settlement agreement, and again that violated the discussion we had about not referencing obligations under the settlement agreement.

THE COURT: The reference in the marketing materials to the website was pursuant to the former settlement agreement?

MR. BADINI: The settlement agreement between Skyline and PilePro said a couple of things, but in broad strokes

Skyline was to purchase its connectors from PilePro, and in return it was to put them in its brochures in certain ways,

including telling consumers how to get them. And the way they could get them was to go to the PilePro website. So they were there because we needed to give contact information to comply with the settlement agreement.

THE COURT: OK. So what do you propose I do, or what is the application?

MR. BADINI: The application is for a curative instruction. I don't have one here, but we could draft one overnight for the court's review.

THE COURT: All right. So why don't you draft one, and then we can consider it in the context of a specific proposal. I think I had told you to perhaps draft one last week and have it in your back pocket.

MR. BADINI: Although I didn't know precisely what would happen but, yes, point taken, your Honor.

THE COURT: Understood. I will decide whether it's appropriate or necessary. I certainly have the same reaction in particular to the suggestion that few people would have visited the website during the busy holiday period. I thought that struck me as the clearest case perhaps for crossing the line of my ruling. I think let's defer discussion until there is a specific curative instruction on the table. I may decide not to give it at this point, but let this just be a little bit of a warning to folks at the back table that I will certainly police that ruling and make sure that it doesn't get crossed.

And the jury has been told that what the lawyers say is not evidence, and if evidence in later argument is not made on this score, then it may just be that it's better to leave it as is, but I will consider it when there is a curative instruction proposed. Anything else we have to take up? Otherwise, I want to give you a couple minutes before we resume.

MR. RAMOS: Real quick, your Honor, and that is with respect to objections. I'm sorry, forgive me if I didn't catch when you were giving the jury its initial instructions with respect to what objections are and what their application is in the case. I don't know if the court has done that.

THE COURT: I did. I explained that to them, and if you had listened, you would have heard that. Anything else?

Be back in four minutes, and we will be ready to go.

(Recess)

(Continued on next page)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

(Jury present)

THE COURT: Welcome back, ladies and gentlemen. hope you had an enjoyable break. We will continue with the direct examination of Mr. De Mey.

Mr. De Mey, I remind you you are still under oath and to speak slowly, clearly and wait for the question to finish.

Go ahead.

MR. BADINI: Thank you, your Honor.

LAURENT DE MEY, resumed.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. BADINI:

- Q. Welcome back, Mr. De Mey. I believe that the question we left off on before the break, just to put you back in the context, was whether in the course of your career you had
- discussions with engineers about the factors they considered in 15
- deciding which sheet pile product to purchase. Do you remember 16
- 17 that question?
- 18 Α. I do.
- 19 And can you remind us of your answer? Q.
- 20 Α. Yes, my answer was yes.
- 21 How many such discussions have you had? Q.
- 22 Α. Multiple, tens and tens of conversations.
- 23 In what context were those discussions? 0.
- 24 In the context of selling or promoting our product to the 25 engineering community.

- And during those discussions, did you come to learn 1 OK.
- from the engineers, did they tell you, in other words, what 2
- 3 factors they considered important in choosing a sheet pile
- 4 product?
- 5 Α. Yes.
- Which factors? 6 0.
- 7 The main factor is availability, knowing when the material will be available. 8
- 9 MS. GHAVIMI: Objection. Hearsay, your Honor.
- 10 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 11 And the second factor is obviously its technical
- 12 specificities, what it can do, how it is made, what the weight
- 13 would be, what the steel grades would be, the details of the
- 14 product.
- 15 And in those discussions when the issue of availability
- came up, did they tell you what they meant by availability? 16
- 17 Yes. Α.
- What did they tell you? 18
- When an engineer designs a technical solution to a 19
- 20 technical problem, they will want to be absolutely certain that
- 21 the product that is specified will be available in the market
- 22 when the project actually goes into execution. They want to
- 23 know whether the product will be there and exists and will be
- 24 available for somebody to use.
- 25 Did they tell you why that was important to them?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

14

20

21

22

De Mey - direct

- A. Well, of course your reputation would be a problem. If they design something that is not available, it means that they don't know what the market is.
 - Second of all, it takes a lot of time and a lot of money to design projects, and once a project goes into execution there is not much time left to really finish a job, and, therefore, they really do not want to be confronted with a situation in which the material would not be there, and therefore redesign would have to take place and possible consequences to delay the start of the project.
- 11 Q. Has Skyline ever lost a job based on availability or timing 12 issues?
- 13 A. Yes, sure we have.
 - Q. Are you familiar with the concept of lead times?
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. What does that mean to you?
- A. The lead time is the time necessary between ordering the steel or signing a contract to order the steel and the actual delivery to the job site.
 - Q. And based on the size of the job and the requirements of the customer, are you able to quote as a company the expected lead times for the product they want?
- 23 \parallel A. Yes, we are.
- Q. Has Skyline ever altered its lead times based on extraordinary circumstances?

- Α. Absolutely.
- And can you think of any examples when that has happened? 2 Q.
- 3 Yes. So, everybody remembers Super Storm Sandy, in this
- area for sure. Well, based on examples like this, like natural 4
- 5 catastrophes, we will change any possible production schedules
- 6 we have, or try to accelerate production schedules with some of
- 7 our suppliers to be able to deliver material quickly. We had
- the same thing happen during the Katrina hurricane. There has 8
- 9 been a huge need for steel, a very quick notice. People were
- 10 under water and steel was necessary to kind of protect them or
- 11 protect existing buildings, and we changed production schedule
- 12 both in our own facilities as well as our upstream partners,
- 13 people making steel for us.
- 14 Q. So, let's shift gears a little bit and talk about another
- 15 subject. Did Skyline ever learn of any letters that PilePro
- sent to Skyline customers about the HZM system? 16
- 17 Α. Yes.
- 18 Did you ever hear of such a letter that went to John
- 19 Madonna Construction Company?
- 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 What is John Madonna Construction Company? Q.
- 22 John Madonna is a contractor based on the West Coast, and
- 23 he is a customer of ours.
- 24 How did Skyline learn of that letter from PilePro to John
- 25 Madonna Construction Company?

- Well, Mr. Madonna sent a letter to our office that we have 1 2 in Sacramento complaining about the fact that he had received a
- 3 letter from PilePro.
- 4 Q. Let me show you what we have premarked as Plaintiff's
- 5 Exhibit 280, two-eight-zero. Can you identify this for the
- 6 record?
- 7 Α. Yes.
- What is it? 8 Q.
- 9 It is a letter from John Madonna to somebody called Matt
- 10 McLauglin who worked in our Sacramento California office.
- 11 When you say a letter, do you mean --
- 12 Α. An e-mail, and there is an attachment here too.
- 13 And what is the attachment? 0.
- 14 The attachment is a letter from the PilePro group to John Α.
- 15 Madonna Construction on November 1, 2013, signed by Mr. Wendt.
- And did you receive a copy of this cover e-mail and the 16
- 17 letter and the attachment to the letter at or about the time it
- 18 was sent to Skyline by Mr. Madonna on November 11, 2013?
- 19 Α. Yes, I did.
- 20 MR. BADINI: I move to admit 280 and publish it to the
- 21 jury.
- 22 THE COURT: Any objection?
- 23 MS. GHAVIMI: No objection.
- 24 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 25 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 280 received in evidence)

- MR. BADINI: Thank you, your Honor. 1
- So, let's -- let's start with the -- well, let's start with 2 Q.
- 3 the cover page. Is this the e-mail you talked about from
- 4 Mr. Madonna?
- 5 Yes, I did. Α.
- 6 And let's go to the attachment, and then we will circle
- 7 back to the e-mail. So, let's look at the next page. Is this
- the PilePro letter? 8
- 9 That is the PilePro letter, yes.
- 10 Ο. And where was it sent?
- It was sent to John Madonna Construction in California. 11
- 12 OK. If you look at the subject line of the letter, can you
- 13 read that into the record, please.
- 14 A. It's called Bradley Canyon Levee Extension, Santa Maria
- River and Tributaries. 15
- Do you know what that is a reference to? 16
- 17 That is a reference to a job that we supplied material to
- John Madonna. 18
- 19 Q. Near the bottom, do you know who signed the letter on
- 20 behalf of PilePro?
- 21 Α. Yes.
- 22 Ο. Who signed it?
- 23 Α. Mr. Wendt.
- 24 Ο. And do you know who Rob Wendt is?
- 25 Α. I do.

- 1 OK. So, let's look at the text of the letter. first paragraph, can you read that into the record, please. 2
- 3 "Dear Sirs: It has come to our attention that an imported 4 HZM wall system supplied by Skyline Steel, Inc. may be 5 contemplated for use in connection with the above referenced
- construction project." 6

of our patent."

- 7 Now the second paragraph, please.
- "The United States Patent and Trademark Office has issued a 8 9 patent to PilePro, LLC that covers the wall system method being 10 sold by Skyline Steel and other third parties under the HZM 11 For your convenience and review, I am attaching a copy
 - And the third paragraph, please.
- 14 "We are also attaching the original specifications using Α. steel made and manufactured in the United States by Gerdau and 15 Should you wish to allow the supply of the originally 16 17 specified products, they are readily available."
 - Q. At the time that you saw this, did you have an understanding of what Mr. Wendt meant by that paragraph?
- 20 Α. Yes.

12

13

18

- 21 What was that understanding? Q.
- 22 He meant to replace the HZM products that we had supplied Α. 23 or were supplying by another solution that he would supply.
- 24 Now let's look at the fourth paragraph of his letter. 25 Can you read that into the record.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

25

- "This letter places you on notice of PilePro's patent rights and constitutes a warning to you that PilePro will seek to hold all parties participating in the project liable for any damages to which it may be entitled in the event a wall system, components or method that infringes PilePro's patents is installed or otherwise used in this project."
- OK. Now let's turn back to the cover e-mail from Mr. Madonna to the Skyline sales manager Mr. McLauglin. did you understand Mr. Madonna to be asking for from Skyline? He is asking for indemnification of liability of a potential lawsuit that may come from us using this product.
- Now let's look in particular at the fourth paragraph.

Can we blow that up?

Can you read the first sentence, please.

- "I must add emphasis on the fact that we have delivery of Α. the steel and have been installing the combi wall."
- Did you attach any particular significance to that statement by Mr. McLauglin?
- Absolutely. Α.
- What significance did you attach to it? 0.
- 21 The fact that we already delivered material and that some 22 of it was already driven in the ground or had been installed, 23 as he says.
 - So, did you consider it a possibility that you might have to pay Mr. Madonna to rip up that combi wall and pay for that?

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Α. Absolutely.
- How much would that have cost? 2 Q.
- 3 Hundreds of thousands, maybe millions. Α.
- 4 Of dollars? Q.
- 5 Of dollars, yes. Α.
 - Certainly more than \$5,000, correct? 0.
- 7 Definitely more than \$5,000. Α.

MS. GHAVIMI: Objection, your Honor. It assumes facts not in evidence.

THE COURT: Overruled.

- So, at the time you received this letter from Mr. Madonna in what you call this request for indemnification, did you know whether or not you would have to rip out the combi wall?
- 14 Α. No, not at all, we did not know.
- What if anything did Skyline do in response to receiving 15 Ο. this e-mail from Mr. Madonna? 16
 - A. Well, he was asking to be getting an answer within 24 hours, of us covering his liability, which is what we did, by offering him better indemnification.

THE COURT: Can you explain what you mean by indemnification?

THE WITNESS: Well, we would indemnify him for his possible lawyers fees, possible legal costs, possible rip out of the material and reinstalling the wall, to all possible consequences of this being a possible infringement of this

patent.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

By indemnification you mean an agreement THE COURT: whereby Skyline would agree to cover any costs that are connected to this matter that would otherwise have been incurred by the Madonna company; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK.

- Q. And did you agree to give him that indemnification or promise?
- 10 Α. We did.
- 11 Take a look at what we've marked as Exhibit 275. 12 you identify this document for the record.
- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 What is it? Q.
- 15 It's an indemnification agreement from Skyline towards John
- Madonna Construction. 16
- 17 OK. Are those -- is that your signature on the last page? Ο.
- 18 That is my signature, yes. Α.
- 19 And are those your initials on the first two pages? Q.
- 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 MR. BADINI: Move to admit Exhibit 275 and ask 22 permission to publish it to the jury.
- 23 THE COURT: Any objection?
- 24 MS. GHAVIMI: No objection.
- 25 THE COURT: Admitted.

(Plaintiff's Exhibit 275 in evidence)

- Take a look at the first page under number one, 2
- 3 indemnification. Can you just read -- you don't have to read
- the whole paragraph, but can you read the first few lines, "In 4
- 5 the event ... "
- "In the event any claim, suit, or cause of action alleging 6
- 7 to infringement of patents is filed against a party
- 8 (Indemnitee)..."
- 9 Q. Let me stop you there, because it goes on for a long time.
- 10 Did you understand that -- what did you understand this letter
- 11 agreement -- let me rephrase that. What did you understand
- this indemnification document to obligate Skyline to do? 12
- 13 A. It would obligate Skyline in case there would be any legal
- 14 action from PilePro to John Madonna Construction, that Skyline
- would cover everything, going from legal fees, to defense fees, 15
- to even possible consequences like tearing apart the entire 16
- 17 wall and starting over.
- 18 Q. And did you send this indemnification agreement in this
- 19 form with your signature to Mr. Madonna?
- 20 Yes, we did. Α.
- 21 You will see on the last page there is no signature by
- 22 Mr. Madonna on this document.
- 23 Α. I see it.
- 24 Did you view that as in any way diminishing what you viewed
- 25 as your obligations to Mr. Madonna?

- 1 Α. No.
- Was there anything else Mr. Madonna asked of Skyline 2 Q. OK.
- 3 as a result of receiving PilePro's letter? So, for example,
- 4 did they ask you to pay his legal fees?
- 5 Yeah, sure, they asked us to pay their legal fees.
- And did Skyline do so? 6 0.
- 7 We did. Α.
- 8 Q. Let's shift gears again. Putting aside the letters or the
- 9 letter to Mr. Madonna, do you know whether PilePro maintains a
- 10 website?
- 11 Yes, PilePro does.
- 12 Have you ever visited the PilePro website?
- 13 Α. I have.
- 14 Are you aware of the infringement accusation that PilePro
- made on its website? 15
- 16 Α. I am.
- 17 Let me show you what we have premarked as Plaintiff's
- 18 Exhibit 19 and ask you whether you are familiar with this.
- 19 Α. Yes.
- 20 What is this? 0.
- 21 This is a page from the iSheetPile.com website, that this
- 22 describes a product that we called the HZM. That describes
- 23 something that we sell. But there is a warning on top here
- 24 that is very visible.
- 25 Don't read the warning.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

De Mey - direct

- 1 Α. There was a warning.
 - Move to enter Exhibit 19 into evidence and publish to the Q. jury.

THE COURT: Can we get a timeframe, Mr. Badini?

MR. BADINI: Sure.

- Do you know when this warning was posted by PilePro on the website, approximately?
- Approximately, yeah. At the time of our -- at the time we had this discussion, two or three years ago.
 - Ο. Is this a screen shot?
- 11 Oh, that could be wrong.

12 THE COURT: Is this a screen shot from the website?

THE WITNESS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you know when this screen shot was taken?

THE WITNESS: A couple months ago, two or three months ago. I don't know.

- Q. Do you know -- let me rephrase. Do you know when the infringement accusation was posted by PilePro on the website?
- 20 A. Yeah. In -- sorry. I think it's 2013 we had our original 21 discussion.

22 THE COURT: You can't let your voice trail off, because then nobody can understand the last words that you say. 23 24 So, you say you recall the infringement accusation being on the

25 website in 2013.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

2 THE COURT: OK, next question.

MR. BADINI: Just same motion to admit and publish.

THE WITNESS: I think it was, yes.

THE COURT: All right. Any objection?

MS. GHAVIMI: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Admitted.

(Plaintiff's Exhibit 19 received in evidence)

- Do you have it in front of you now Mr. De Mey?
- Α. I do.
- Can you please for the benefit of the jury read the warning into the record.
- 12 "Warning: This product infringes a U.S. patent owned by
- 13 PilePro LLC. Click here to view the patent. If you would like
- 14 more details and to use this patented system, please e-mail
- info at PilePro.com or call 866-666-74883." 15
- Q. Now, what products are depicted on that page? And maybe we 16
- can take off the -- yeah, thank you. Take off the -- what 17
- 18 products are depicted on that page?
- 19 This is the HZM system, and its individual components.
- 20 THE COURT: Just again, to get the timeframe, your
- 21 recollection and understanding is that the infringement warning
- 22 was posted sometime in 2013?
- 23 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 24 THE COURT: And have you been to the website since
- 25 2013?

1 THE WITNESS: I have.

THE COURT: And is the infringement warning still

3 there?

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

THE WITNESS: No, no.

5 THE COURT: So this screen shot, do you know when it

was created, since the infringement warning is there?

THE WITNESS: I don't know. I don't.

THE COURT: Does this accurately reflect what the web

page looked like in the period in 2013 that you are describing?

THE WITNESS: Looks like it, yes.

THE COURT: OK, go on.

MR. BADINI: Thank you, your Honor.

- So you said you have visited the website since then?
- 14 Yes, I have. Α.
- 15 Q. When is the most recent time you visited the PilePro
- website? 16
- 17 A. Last week.
- 18 Q. Last week?
- 19 Α. Yes.
- 20 In the visits to the website, have you seen whether the
- 21 PilePro uses the HZM trademark on its website?
- 22 A. Yes, it does.
- 23 Q. Does it publish what we've called lead times for HZM
- 24 products?
- 25 A. Yes, it does.

- De Mey direct
- 1 Did Skyline ever provide this lead time information to
- 2 PilePro to publish on the website?
- 3 No. Α.
- Do you know where PilePro got it? 4 Q.
- I have no idea. 5 Α.
- Did you take a look at the precise lead times that were 6
- 7 shown for Skyline products?
- Yes, there are a couple. 8 Α.
- 9 Based on your experience were they accurate? Q.
- 10 No, I don't think they are. Α.
- 11 0. Were they some sort of an average of Skyline's lead times?
- 12 Α. No.
- 13 Let's take a look at another exhibit, 573. Can you 0. OK.
- identify this for the record? 14
- 15 Α. Yes, I can.
- 16 And what is it? 0.
- 17 It is a page from iSheetPile.com. Α.
- 18 And have you seen this page on your visits to the website?
- 19 Α. Yes.
- 20 MR. BADINI: Move to admit and publish 573.
- 21 MS. GHAVIMI: No objection.
- 22 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 23 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 573 received in evidence)
- 24 Now that the jury is looking at it, can you tell us what is
- 25 shown in the middle of the page of this screen shot?

- 1 In the middle of the page you see something called "or find 2 a sheet pile section."
- 3 Q. And beneath that, what are those things that are listed?
- 4 What are those?
- 5 A. So all of these names that you see, an exact VZ22 or VZ13,
- 6 or VZ27 and so forth, are all different types of sheet pile
- 7 products.
- 8 And do those include some of Skyline's sheet pile products?
- 9 Yes, absolutely. Α.
- 10 For example, which ones in that list? Ο.
- 11 VZ22, ZV26, 40, and so on. HZM also.
- 12 And based on your visit, do you know what happens when you
- 13 click on one of those links?
- 14 A. So when you click on those, the page will describe in
- detail this one solution you picked, will describe its 15
- technical specifications. It will also offer a number of 16
- 17 competing solutions to the one that you just clicked; will
- 18 describe the other solutions and their specificities.
- 19 All right. So let's take a look at an example. Let's look
- 20 at Exhibit 574. Can you identify this for the jury.
- 21 Yes, I can. Α.
- 22 Ο. What is this?
- 23 It is the detail page that will appear if you click on the
- 24 HZM 1180 solution.
- 25 And that's a Skyline product.

- 1 That is a Skyline product.
- MR. BADINI: Offer 574 and permission to publish, 2
- 3 please.
- 4 MS. GHAVIMI: No objection.
- 5 THE COURT: Admitted.
- (Plaintiff's Exhibit 574 received in evidence) 6
- 7 Q. Now take a look at the picture. This is a Skyline product,
- 8 correct?
- 9 Yes, sir. Α.
- 10 Now, this exhibit has two pages because of the size of the
- 11 page. If you look at the first page, at the bottom right, you
- 12 see that the red bar there?
- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 Can you read what is in the top red bar?
- 15 Α. Yes, I can.
- 16 What does it say? Q.
- 17 Request a Quote. Α.
- 18 Have you tried -- when you visited the website, did you
- click on that button? 19
- 20 Yes, I did. Α.
- 21 And what happened? Q.
- 22 It goes to another page that describes who to contact at
- 23 PilePro for more information or quote or sales of this product.
- 24 THE COURT: And once again can you just tell me do
- 25 these screen shots, Exhibit 573 and 574, does this reflect what

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

De Mey - direct

the website looked like last week when you visited it? 1

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: OK.

- And to your knowledge, has anyone ever gotten directed to Skyline by pressing Request a Quote on the PilePro website?
 - Not to my knowledge. Α.

on that half of the page?

- OK. Now, take a look at the second half of the page, or the second page in the printout of this web page. What appears
- 10 So here on the left-hand side appears the alternative 11 solutions to the original one that we just clicked. So again 12 if you click on one solution, on the bottom of the page will 13 appear other possible technical solutions that have equivalent
- 14 metrics.
- 15 And do you see anywhere on that list any of the Skyline HZM 16 system products?
- 17 Α. Yes.
- 18 Where are they? OK.
- 19 So, the yellow one, which is highlighted here, but also on 20 the actual website, shows the original solution which was 21 clicked. So in this case it was the HZM 1180M, and it compares 22 that to the other solutions that are technically at least 23 equivalent.
- 24 And do you see there is a column at the top that's called 25 "available". Do you see that?

- Α. Yes.

- Under that, what is listed for that Skyline product? 2 Q.
- 3 So for this particular Skyline product it says 16 weeks. Α.
- And what did you understand that to mean? 4 Q.
- 5 I understand that to be the lead time, which is the
- 6 delivery time needed between order and final delivery, 16 weeks
- 7 in this case.
- Q. And is that an accurate representation of what the lead 8
- 9 time is for that Skyline product?
- 10 A. No, it's not.
- 11 Q. Based on your experience, what is the lead time for that
- 12 Skyline product?
- 13 A. Lead sometimes vary, and we could deliver this material in
- 14 eight weeks, between eight and 12 weeks. I would say it
- 15 depends on the specificities of the quantity, the length of the
- material, the urgency of the job as. As I described before, 16
- 17 for urgency matters we could do it much quicker if need be.
- 18 the timing is variable. 16 weeks is too long.
- 19 Q. Let's go back to the first page. Do you see there is some
- 20 fine print at the bottom of that page?
- 21 Α. I do.
- 22 Q. Maybe we can blow it up. Take a look in particular at the
- 23 third sentence beginning with the word "information". Do you
- 24 see that?
- 25 Yes. Α.

- 1 Can you read that to the jury, please.
- "Information is taken from the latest known manufacturer 2 Α.
- 3 catalogs and websites."
- OK. Are you aware of any Skyline product catalogs that 4 Q.
- 5 contain lead time information?
- No. 6 Α.
- 7 Are you aware of -- does Skyline maintain a website?
- 8 Α. We do.
- 9 Are you aware of anywhere on the Skyline website where
- 10 Skyline lead time information is published?
- 11 No, we don't publish lead times.
- 12 How about ArcelorMittal, are you aware of any ArcelorMIttal
- 13 catalog where lead time information is published for the HZM
- 14 products?
- 15 Α. No, ArcelorMittal does not publish lead times.
- Does ArcelorMittal maintain a website? 16 0.
- 17 Α. Yes.
- 18 Are you aware of anywhere on their website where lead time
- 19 information is published for their products?
- 20 Α. No.
- 21 Now let's look at another exhibit, 575. Can you identify
- 22 this one for the record?
- 23 Yes, I can. Α.
- 24 0. What is this?
- 25 This is the HZM 1180 MD-14 on the iSheetPile website. Α.

GBT7SKY6 De Mey - direct

- 1 That's the PilePro website?
 - Α. Yes.

- 3 How does this differ from the one we just looked at?
- This one has a different intermediate sheet file section, 4 Α.
- 5 so in this case it's an AZ 1470, as you can see. And the
- former one was AZ 19-700. It's a different intermediate sheet 6
- 7 level.
- 8 Q. And is this a screen shot of what you viewed when you
- 9 visited the PilePro website last week?
- 10 A. Yes.
- MR. BADINI: Move to admit 576 and offer -- I'm 11
- 12 sorry -- and permission to publish it to the jury.
- 13 THE COURT: I think it was 575.
- 14 MR. BADINI: 575. I stand corrected, your Honor.
- 15 THE COURT: Any objection?
- 16 MS. GHAVIMI: No objection.
- 17 THE COURT: Admitted.
- (Plaintiff's Exhibit 575 received in evidence) 18
- 19 Do you see on the second page what availability is OK.
- 20 published for this HZM product?
- 21 Yes, I do. Α.
- 22 What is the lead time published for that product?
- It's also 16 weeks. 23 Α.
- 24 Ο. Is it accurate for this product?
- 25 Α. No.

- 1 Q. OK. Now let's take a look at 576. Sorry I was jumping
- 2 | ahead. Can you identify -- oh, I'm sorry. Before we go to
- 3 | 576, staying on 575. Does that also have the Request a Quote
- 4 button on that page?
- 5 A. Yes, it does.
- Q. Now let's go to 576. Can you identify this one for the
- 7 record?
- 8 | A. So this is another page of the iSheetPile.com website,
- 9 | PilePro's website in which the detail of a product or a
- 10 | solution is shown, in this case the HZM 1180 MD-24/AZ19.
- 11 | Q. And did you view this page in forms shown on 576 when you
- 12 | visited last week?
- 13 | A. Yes.
- MR. BADINI: Move to admit 576, and permission to
- 15 publish to the jury.
- 16 | THE COURT: Any objection?
- MS. GHAVIMI: No objection.
- 18 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 19 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 576 received in evidence)
- 20 \parallel Q. And again look at the lead times published for this HZM
- 21 | system on that page. What is that?
- 22 | A. Again, 16 weeks.
- 23 | 0. Is that accurate?
- 24 | A. No.
- 25 | Q. All right. Let's look at 577. Can you identify that for

GBT7SKY6 De Mey - direct

- 1 | the jury.
- 2 A. Yes, I can.
- $3 \parallel Q$. And what is that?
- 4 A. It's again a page from the iSheetPile.com website
- 5 describing the detailed technical specifications of a product,
- 6 in this case HZM 1180 MD-26 and intermediate sheet pile
- 7 AZ26-700.
- 8 Q. Did you view that page, substantially this form, when you
- 9 | went to the website last week?
- 10 | A. Yes.
- MR. BADINI: Move to admit and publish 577.
- MS. GHAVIMI: No objection.
- 13 THE COURT: Admitted.
- 14 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 577 received in evidence)
- 15 | Q. Now, does that show the lead times for this Skyline
- 16 product?
- 17 A. It does.
- 18 | Q. And what is that?
- 19 A. 16 weeks.
- 20 | 0. Is that accurate?
- 21 | A. No.
- 22 | Q. And does that also include a Request a Quote?
- 23 | A. It does.
- Q. So I don't have to keep asking you, on every page that you
- 25 | visited of these products, did those pages include a Request a

2

Quote button?

- Every page does or did. Α.
- 3 Q. Now let's look at Exhibit 579. Can you identify this
- document for the record. 4
- 5 A. It's another page from iSheetPile.com which describes one
- specific product and its technical details. This product is 6
- 7 the AZ 36-7010M.
- 8 Q. Is this Exhibit 579 a picture of what you saw when you
- 9 visited the website last week?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 MR. BADINI: Move to admit 579 and publish to the
- 12 jury.
- 13 MS. GHAVIMI: No objection.
- 14 THE COURT: Admitted.
- (Plaintiff's Exhibit 579 received in evidence) 15
- 16 Q. Now, if you look at the picture on the first page, how does
- 17 this product differ, if at all, from the products we have just
- 18 been looking back in terms of screen shots?
- 19 This product is just sheet piles; it's not an HZM solution.
- 20 In other words, it's not a king pile, the connector and sheet
- 21 pile; it's only sheet piles.
- 22 And it's one particular kind of AZ pile, correct?
- 23 Α. Yes.
- 24 The last exhibit we looked at, 577, can you look at that Ο.
- 25 for a second, maybe the cover page. If you could put that up.

- 1 Do you see where it says HZM 1180 MD-26/AZ 26-700?
- 2 Α. Yes.
- 3 That was a mouthful. But let's talk about the part Sorry.
- 4 after the slash, AZ 26-700. Do you know what that is?
- 5 Α. Yes.
- 6 What is that? 0.
- 7 It's an AZ sheet pile. Α.
- 8 So is that sold only as part of the HZM system?
- 9 Α. No.
- 10 Is it also sold alone? Ο.
- 11 Α. Yes.
- 12 Did you visit -- does the PilePro website have a page for
- 13 that sheet pile, the AZ 26-700?
- 14 Yes. Α.
- 15 Q. Did you visit that website last week?
- 16 Α. Yes.
- 17 That web page, I meant. Q.
- 18 Web page, yes, on this AZ 26-700, yes. Α.
- 19 What lead time did the website report for that page? Q.
- 20 It says four weeks. Α.
- 21 Is that accurate? Q.
- 22 Α. No.
- 23 Why not? Q.
- 24 Because we have them in stock right now, available right
- 25 here for delivery tomorrow if need be.

- 1 Did PilePro list on that page any products that were 2 competitive with the AZ 26-700?
- 3 Yes. Α.
- 4 Can you give me an example? Q.
- 5 The PZC 26. Α.
- 6 0. PZC?
- 7 Α. Yes.
- Who makes the PZC 26? 8 Q.
- 9 The PZC 26 is a product made by Gerdau. Α.
- 10 Is that that steel company you talked about earlier? Q.
- 11 It is the Brazilian steel company we talked about before,
- 12 yes.
- 13 What lead time did PilePro list for that product? 0.
- 14 Two weeks. Α.
- Do you have any basis to assess whether that is accurate or 15 Q.
- 16 not?
- 17 MS. GHAVIMI: Objection. Lack of knowledge.
- 18 THE COURT: Overruled. Just yes or no.
- 19 Α. Yes.
- 20 And what basis -- without telling me first whether it's
- 21 accurate or not, what basis do you have for assessing the
- 22 accuracy or inaccuracy of that statement?
- 23 A. Well, that's my job. I am in charge of a steel company
- 24 that sells this product every day, so I should know what our
- 25 competitors do on a daily basis. I wouldn't be running the

- 1 company well.
- Q. Let me ask a follow-up question. And in that connection, 2
- 3 have you gotten access to the information about your
- 4 competitors' availability and supply schedules?
- 5 Α. Yes.
- Based on that experience, do you know whether that lead 6
- 7 time published with respect to the Gerdau product is accurate
- or not? 8
- 9 MS. GHAVIMI: Objection. Lack of personal knowledge.
- 10 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 11 Are you familiar with another Skyline product known as the
- 12 SKZ 31?
- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 What is that? Q.
- 15 Α. SKZ 31 is a cold formed sheetrock pile.
- And how, if at all, does that differ from the process you 16
- 17 described as hot rolling?
- 18 A. A cold rolling process is in which you take a piece of flat
- 19 steel and at room temperature, which we call cold rolling, you
- 20 will roll a piece of steel through a number of rolls and create
- 21 a shape, also like a Z shape, similar to the hydro sheets,
- 22 except the interlock is slightly different; it's not as
- 23 perfect.
- 24 Did you observe that product on the PilePro website last
- 25 week?

- 1 Α. Yes.
- What lead time was listed for that product? 2 Q.
- 3 Eight weeks. Α.
- Was that accurate? 4 Q.
- 5 Α. No.
- 6 Why not? 0.
- 7 Several reasons. We have SKZ 31 in stock, and if somebody
- were to need something that we don't have in stock, we have raw 8
- 9 material in stock to be able to make it on demand in a couple
- 10 days.
- 11 Q. Are you familiar with a product that is called the
- Shoreline MSZ 19? 12
- 13 Yes. Α.
- 14 What is that product? Q.
- It's also a cold form sheet pile produced by one of our 15 Α.
- competitors called Shoreline. 16
- 17 Did you observe that lead time on PilePro's website?
- 18 MS. GHAVIMI: Objection, your Honor. Relevance.
- 19 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 What was it listed as? Q.
- 22 Α. I believe it's four weeks.
- 23 And do you have any basis to know whether or not that is
- 24 accurate?
- 25 THE COURT: Yes or no.

I have no basis if it's accurate or not. 1 Α.

THE COURT: Just yes or no.

Α. No.

2

3

4

7

9

- Did you observe on the PilePro website products called O Q.
- 5 pipe products?
- 6 A. Yes.
 - Do you know what those are?
- 8 Yes. Α.
 - Q. What kind of products are those?
- 10 Α. That is a pipe wall, a continuous wall of pipe that are put together through a specific type of interlock. 11

(Continued on next page)

13

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 1 BY MR. BANDINI:
- 2 | Q. Do you know whether PilePro promotes those O-Pile products?
- 3 A. Yes, PilePro does.
- 4 | Q. Did you see whether the Web site published lead times for
- 5 | those products?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 | Q. Do you consider those products to be competitive with
- 8 | Skyline's combination wall systems?
- 9 A. They compete with Skyline's product, yeah.
- 10 | Q. Are you familiar with a particular O-Pile product known as
- 11 | the 2307 O-Pile product?
- 12 | A. Yes.
- 13 MS. GHAVIMI: Objection, your Honor. Relevance.
- 14 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 15 | A. Yes.
- 16 | Q. What do you know about that product?
- 17 | A. It's an O-Pile. So it's a pipe combined with a special
- 18 | interlock of a certain diameter and a certain wall thickness
- 19 combination.
- 20 Q. Did you observe a lead time reported by PilePro for that
- 21 | product on its Web site?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 0. What was it?
- 24 A. Four weeks.
- Q. Was that accurate?

GBTHSKY7

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

MS. GHAVIMI: Objection, your Honor. Lack of personal knowledge.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Do you have any basis -- let me rephrase. Q.

Do you have any basis for determining whether or not that lead time is accurate?

- Α. Yes.
- Q. What is your basis?
- 9 I have -- first of all, I'm in this business every day.
- 10 Second of all, I have run operations that make pipe, and this
- 11 would require pipe to be produced, which means raw material has
- to be bought from a steel mill, which takes time. Then the 12
- 13 pipe has to be produced and the interlock has to be welded to
- 14 the pipe, all which takes much more time than four weeks.
- personal experience tells me this. 15
- 16 Are lead times related to the size of the job?
- 17 Absolutely. Α.
- 18 In what way? Q.
- You may have inventory available for smaller jobs; and, 19
- 20 therefore, the lead times can be very, very short. For bigger
- 21 jobs, you may not have everything that is needed for this one
- 22 job; and, therefore, you may have to order from a steel mill
- 23 and wait. So lead times are very dependent on the size of the
- 24 actual job or the volume of material you need for it.
- 25 Has Skyline, to your knowledge, ever complained to PilePro

- that PilePro is posting what you viewed as inaccurate lead 1
- times for your products? 2
- 3 Yes, we have. Α.
- Were you involved in any such complaints? 4 Q.
- 5 Yes. We have had several conversations with PilePro for
- that, yeah. 6
- 7 What was said?
- Well, we asked PilePro to not post any lead times and also 8
- 9 to take out our products from this list.
- 10 What -- who, in particular, at PilePro were these
- 11 conversations with?
- 12 Α. With Mr. Wendt.
- 13 And what did PilePro do in response to that? 0.
- 14 Nothing. Nothing. Α.
- 15 Q. Now, we talked a little bit about the request-to-quote
- I only have a couple more questions about that. 16 button.
- 17 You said -- I think you read -- I'm sorry. You didn't
- 18 read. You said that something popped up with respect to
- 19 PilePro when you clicked on "request to quote"?
- 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 Is that right? Q.
- 22 Α. Yes.
- 23 Was there a phone number there? 0.
- 24 Α. There was a phone number, yes.
- 25 Was that a Skyline phone number?

- Α. No, sir.
- Is PilePro authorized to quote any Skyline product? 2 Q. Okay.
- 3 Α. No.

- 4 Is PilePro authorized to sell any Skyline product? Q.
- 5 Α. No.
- 6 Did Skyline ever complain to PilePro with respect to the
- 7 request-to-quote button?
- Yes. 8 Α.
- 9 What was the complaint? Q.
- 10 Α. We asked to take it out.
- 11 0. What was PilePro's response?
- 12 Α. No answer. No was the answer.
- 13 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Say that again.
- 14 THE WITNESS: They said no or didn't do it.
- 15 Q. Have the -- how have the posting of these lead times
- 16 affected Skyline?
- 17 We believe it has, yes.
- 18 Q. In what way?
- Engineers will look at those lead times to make a decision, 19
- 20 as I explained before, whether a job should be designed in one
- product or another. And by posting Skyline's lead time, in all 21
- 22 the examples we saw, in a negative light compared to any other
- 23 solution, we believe that engineers would have changed their
- 24 minds and therefore maybe preferred other products ahead of
- 25 Skyline's products.

- 1 Does Skyline believe that the request to quote has impacted 2 Skyline?
- 3 A. Yes, we believe that because of the fact that the request
- 4 to quote did not divert any of these requests towards Skyline
- 5 but towards PilePro. PilePro could easily talk to that
- customer and try to convert him into using a PilePro-preferred 6
- 7 type solution, away from our solutions.
 - MR. BANDINI: No further questions at this time. Your witness.
- 10 THE COURT: Cross-examination.
- 11 MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, may I approach the witness?
- 12 THE COURT: You may.
- 13 CROSS-EXAMINATION
- BY MS. GHAVIMI: 14

8

- 15 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. De Mey.
- 16 Α. Good afternoon.
- 17 I'd like to start with -- I don't know if you have in front
- 18 of you the joint stipulated facts. Are they in the binder from
- the plaintiff's examination? 19
- 20 I'm not sure. No, I don't think they are.
- 21 MS. GHAVIMI: If I could approach the witness, your
- 22 Honor?
- 23 THE COURT: You may.
- 24 This is previously entered into evidence as
- 25 Plaintiff's Trial Exhibit 585. Do you see that document in

- front of you? 1
- 2 Α. I do.
- 3 Okay. Thank you. 0.
- 4 THE COURT: I think it's 584, counsel.
- 5 MS. GHAVIMI: Oh, I'm sorry, 584.
- 6 And I apologize. I do not have it to publish to the jury.
- 7 I'll just have to read it out for you.
- 8 THE COURT: You're not going to read the whole thing,
- 9 I assume?
- 10 MS. GHAVIMI: No, no, I'm just going to read a couple
- 11 of them.
- 12 Q. If you could look on the first page for me, Mr. De Mey.
- 13 Look at No. 13. Do you see where I am? It's on the first
- 14 page -- I'm sorry. Looking at the wrong one. The second page.
- 15 It's in the middle of the page.
- 16 A. Yes, I see that.
- 17 Could you read that for me. Ο.
- 18 "HZM has been a registered trademark of ArcelorMittal in Α.
- the United States only since December 2, 2014." 19
- 20 Q. Now, do you understand that this is a fact that both
- 21 parties have agreed to and the Court has entered as a true and
- 22 accurate statement?
- 23 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 24 Α. I understand that, yes.
- 25 THE COURT: No, I sustained the objection. So don't

- 1 answer it.
- THE WITNESS: Oh, sorry.
- 3 THE COURT: Thank you. The jury will disregard that
- 4 | last answer.
- 5 Next question.
- 6 BY MS. GHAVIMI:
 - Q. Now, you said that -- I believe it was plaintiff's
- 8 Exhibit 306. If you could turn to that.
- 9 A. I'm looking. Excuse me. How do I find this in here?
- 10 | Q. It's in the plaintiff's binder that you were using with.
- 11 THE COURT: Mr. De Mey, I think it's in the other
- 12 | binder.

- 13 | THE WITNESS: Oh, this document here?
- 14 | Q. No, it's in the binder you were using with Mr. Bandini.
- 15 | A. Oh, sorry.
- 16 | O. It's behind Tab No. 306.
- 17 | A. 306. Sorry. Yes.
- 18 Q. Could you please tell the jury again what this document is.
- 19 A. This document is our Technical Product Manual from Skyline
- 20 | Steel.
- 21 | Q. Could you read what year it's from.
- 22 A. Edition 2014.
- 23 | Q. Okay. Could you turn to the very last page.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 | Q. If you could open up Plaintiff's Exhibit 306.

4

5

6

7

8

9

De Mey - Cross

1 If I have permission to publish this to the jury, your Honor? 2

THE COURT: You may.

- If you could please go to the last page. Right at the very bottom, does it list a date for the edition?
- I believe it does. March '14 edition, so 3/14 edition. Α.
- Is this before or after ArcelorMittal's HZM trademark was registered?
- MR. BANDINI: Objection.
- 10 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 11 I don't know.
- 12 Is March 2014 before or after December 1, 2014?
- 13 It would be before. Α.
- 14 THE COURT: I think we can all agree on that.
- 15 Q. And I think you also testified with regard to this document
- it was blown up -- I apologize to the jury. On this last page, 16
- 17 it says HZM and AMLoCor are registered trademarks of
- ArcelorMittal. Is that accurate? 18
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Do you see that it says HZ and then a little "R" up at the
- 21 top dash M?
- 22 Α. Uh-huh, I do.
- Do you understand what the little "R" at the top means? 23 0.
- 24 I believe it means registered trademark. Α.
- 25 Why is it that the "R" is after the HZ?

- 1 MR. BANDINI: Objection.
- What's your understanding of why the "R" 2 THE COURT:
- 3 is after the HZ?
- 4 I have no idea. I don't know. Α.
- Couldn't it be that it's HZ trademark? 5
- THE COURT: Sustained. 6
 - Does Skyline have a license to use the HZM trademark? Q.
- 8 Α. Yes.

- 9 Is that license written? Ο.
- 10 It's part of our contract, yes. Α.
- 11 0. Does Skyline pay royalty?
- 12 Α. No.
- 13 Does Skyline have a license to use the ArcelorMittal 0.
- 14 trademark?
- 15 We -- no, no, we use -- we can trademark their products.
- We don't -- we're not an ArcelorMittal company, so we will not 16
- 17 use the name ArcelorMittal. We can sell an ArcelorMittal
- 18 product.
- Q. So the fact that ArcelorMittal is written here is not 19
- 20 pursuant to a license?
- 21 That's not what I'm saying. You asked me if we could use
- 22 the name ArcelorMittal in our documents. Yes, we can, in a
- 23 product, but we are not an ArcelorMittal company.
- 24 Q. My question is you have express permission from
- 25 ArcelorMittal to use their name?

GBTHSKY7 De Mey - Cross

- 1 | A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Is that express permission in a writing, a document?
- 3 A. Yes, same agreement, same contract.
- 4 | Q. But you don't pay any royalty for that?
- 5 | A. No.
- 6 Q. Is this Exhibit 306, this 2014 catalog, was this a catalog
- 7 | in use when PilePro sent the Madonna letter?
- 8 A. I believe it was, yes. Sorry, that wouldn't be possible,
- 9 || no.
- 10 THE COURT: Sorry. You need to --
- 11 A. Okay. I meant to say I thought it was, but this is a 2014
- 12 | edition made in March, it cannot be because the letters were
- 13 sent in 2013. So, no, the answer is no.
- 14 | Q. So there was a previous version?
- 15 \parallel A. I assume there was, yes, and I know there is.
- 16 Q. Was there a version in August of 2013 in use?
- 17 | A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Okay. I'd like to take that document that has the clip on
- 19 it. Do you recognize that document?
- 20 | A. Yes.
- 21 | Q. If you could put up on the screen Plaintiff's Exhibit 305.
- 22 MR. BANDINI: Your Honor, we were not given a copy of
- 23 | 305.
- 24 | THE COURT: I think it's your exhibit.
- MS. GHAVIMI: It's your exhibit.

- 1 MR. BANDINI: Oh. I apologize to defense. Objection withdrawn. 2
- BY MS. GHAVIMI: 3
- 4 Is this a document that was created by Skyline Steel in the
- 5 ordinary course of business?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 You recognize this document?
- I do. 8 Α.
- 9 Is this a true and accurate copy of the document -- of the 10 2013 catalog, as you recall?
- 11 A. As I see the front page, I would assume yes.
- 12 MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, I move Plaintiff's Exhibit,
- 13 I believe it's, 80 -- 803 into evidence at this time. Request
- 14 permission to publish it to the jury.
- 15 THE COURT: It's 305.
- 16 MS. GHAVIMI: Oh, 305, sorry.
- 17 THE COURT: Any objection?
- 18 MR. BANDINI: No objection.
- THE COURT: Admitted. 19
- 20 (Plaintiff's Exhibit 305 received in evidence)
- 21 BY MS. GHAVIMI:
- 22 Could you turn to the last page of this document.
- 23 Α. Yes.
- 24 THE COURT: You'd like it published?
- 25 MS. GHAVIMI: Publish it to the jury.

- If you could turn to the last page. Oh, I guess the 1 electronic version I have does not have the --2
- 3 THE COURT: All right. Why don't you proceed with your question. 4
 - Does it have a date on the back?
- 6 Α. Yes.

5

- What is that date?
- 8/13 edition. 8 Α.
- 9 So is this -- where would Skyline have disseminated this
- 10 document?
- 11 To engineers, customers.
- 12 Would Skyline have put this catalog on its Web site?
- 13 Α. Yes.
- 14 Q. Would there have been another catalog also on Skyline's Web
- site at the same time, or would this have been the only 15
- 16 version?
- A. Well, this is the only version of all products. It could 17
- 18 be specific brochures for specific products, yes; but covering
- everything, yes, it's this. 19
- 20 Q. Okay. So if you could turn to the first -- oh.
- 21 So is this the catalog that was in the public eye on
- 22 the date that PilePro sent the Madonna letter?
- 23 A. If this is August 2013, then it's not possible, because the
- 24 letter was sent June 20; right?
- 25 The date that --Q.

- 1 Α. When was the date? Do you mind? Let me check this.
- THE COURT: Mr. De Mey, you can't mumble --2
- 3 THE WITNESS: I can't mumble.
- 4 THE COURT: -- because no one will understand what you
- 5 say.
- 6 THE WITNESS: Let me check, if you don't mind, the
- 7 dates for a second.
- Yes, it would be. 8
- 9 THE COURT: It would be what?
- 10 THE WITNESS: It would be, indeed, the document that
- 11 is in circulation at the time of the Madonna letter.
- BY MS. GHAVIMI: 12
- 13 Q. Would this be the document that is in circulation at the
- 14 time that Skyline sued PilePro in this case?
- 15 Α. I think so, yes.
- O. Would this be the document that was in circulation at the 16
- 17 time the infringement warning was placed on the iSheetPile Web
- site? 18
- A. I believe it is. 19
- 20 O. Would this be the document at the time in circulation at
- 21 the time that Skyline -- let me rephrase that.
- 22 Would this be the document that was in circulation at
- 23 the time you viewed the infringement warnings on the iSheetPile
- 24 Web site that you testified to earlier?
- 25 Α. Yes.

- 1 If you could turn to the first yellow flag. I believe that 2 is page 6.
- 3 Yes. Α.

8

9

10

11

18

- 4 If you could look to the bottom, do you see a Web site Q.
- 5 address there?
- 6 I can see it, yes.
- 7 Could you read that for me.
 - www.PilePro.com. Α.
 - MR. BANDINI: I'm sorry, counsel. What Bates number page are you on, please? We have a different page 6, so -- is this the page?
- 12 I'm sorry, your Honor.
- 13 MS. GHAVIMI: Yes. Could I use that one?
- 14 MR. BANDINI: Okay.
- 15 MS. GHAVIMI: For the record, the Bates is
- SKYLN0006042. 16
- 17 Q. Have you ever gone to the --
 - THE COURT: Can you bring up that page on the screen for everybody else.
- 20 I don't think that's the same page. Why don't we 21 proceed without the screen since that's not working for us. 22 ahead.
- 23 MS. GHAVIMI: Can I -- okay. We don't need it 24 published to the jury.
- 25 THE COURT: That's good.

GBTHSKY7

- Have you ever gone to the PilePro Web site?
- 2 Yes, I have. Α.

- 3 Have you seen a link to iSheetPile there? 0.
- 4 Yes, I have. Α.
- 5 Have you clicked on that link?
- I have. 6 Α.
- 7 Do you know how many other times PilePro's Web site appears
- 8 in this catalog?
- 9 Α. I don't know.
- 10 We can count them. Ο.
- 11 Α. We could.
- 12 I can represent to you it's --
- 13 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 14 Q. Can you turn --
- 15 THE COURT: Counsel, the document's in evidence, so
- unless the witness knows, let's just leave it there for now. 16
- 17 Q. Let's go to the last page again. Is there another Web site
- 18 listed on that page?
- 19 SkylineSteel.com. Α.
- 20 So if one were to look at your catalog and see the PilePro
- 21 Web site, they could potentially visit your catalog and be
- 22 directed to the PilePro Web site?
- 23 MR. BANDINI: Objection.
- 24 THE COURT: Sustained as to form.
- 25 In your opinion, if someone were to view the PilePro --

- were to view this catalog and see the PilePro Web site, would that be an endorsement of PilePro?
- 3 MR. BANDINI: Objection.
- 4 THE COURT: Sustained.
 - Q. Could you turn back to Plaintiff's Exhibit 11.
- 6 A. Yes, I can.
- 7 MS. GHAVIMI: Could we publish that to the jury?
- Q. Could you turn to the first page -- not the cover, but I guess the second page.
- 10 A. Yes, I can.
- 11 Q. Do you see in the third column, the third full paragraph
- 12 down?

- 13 | A. Yes.
- 14 | Q. Could you read that for the jury.
- 15 | A. I can.
- "In 2007, we launched the final research project.
- 17 | Many technical solutions were analyzed and " --
- 18 | Q. I'm sorry to stop you. I think we are on the different
- 19 one. I'm looking at the ArcelorMittal HZM steel wall system,
- 20 | 2013?
- 21 | A. True.
- 22 | Q. Is that not Plaintiff's Exhibit --
- 23 A. That's what I'm reading. Right here, first page you said,
- 24 second column, third paragraph.
- 25 Q. I'm sorry. I said third column.

- Α. Oh, sorry.
- 2 Where it starts "less than one year." Q.
- 3 Α. Yep.

- 4 Less than one year later, in 2008, ArcelorMittal was 5 proud to supply just one time the first HZM system for a huge project in northern Germany, a vast challenge mastered through 6 7 an excellent collaboration between several departments in
- Luxembourg, RND, the rolling mill, the technical, and the sales 8 9 departments.
 - Could you tell me what project in Germany that refers to?
- 11 Α. Yes.

- 12 Could you tell the jury the name of that project.
- 13 I think it's Bremerhaven. Α.
- 14 Bremerhaven? Q.
- 15 Α. Yeah.
- Are you sure that doesn't refer to the JadeWeser Port? 16
- 17 JadeWeser Port, J-a-d-e-r W-e-s-e-r port.
- 18 Could you explain to the jury a little bit about the
- 19 JadeWeser project?
- 20 Not much except it's a big project.
- 21 Okay. That is an HZM system used in that project; isn't
- 22 that correct?
- 23 I think it is, yes.
- 24 Okay. Didn't that HZM system in the JadeWeser Port fail
- 25 332 times?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

De Mey - Cross

1 MR. BANDINI: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained. 2

Next question, counsel.

- Didn't the connectors in the HZM system declutch in the JadeWeser Port 332 times?
 - MR. BANDINI: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained.

New question, counsel.

- Isn't it possible that engineers would not recommend the HZM system because of Arcelor's reputation and not because of an infringement warning on the iSheetPile Web site?
- MR. BANDINI: Objection.

13 THE COURT: Sustained.

- Do engineers talk to each other in this business? Q.
- Α. I don't know. I assume yes.
- You testified you talked to engineers; isn't that true? 16
- 17 That wasn't your question. Your question was if they talk to each other. I don't know. We talk to them. 18
- 19 Do engineers tell you what they hear about your
- 20 competitors?
- 21 They may, yeah. Α.
- 22 Q. Do engineers tell you why they select certain products over
- 23 others?
- 24 Α. Sure, yeah.
- 25 Is one of the reasons engineers select products the

reputation of a company?

- Yeah, could be, yeah. Α.
- 3 Isn't it true that engineers want a product to actually
- 4 work?

1

2

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 5 They do. Α.
- 6 Wouldn't that be a reason why engineers would select a 7 product?
 - Α. Absolutely.
 - Q. Wouldn't that be more important than a lead time in selecting a product?
- 11 MR. BANDINI: Objection.

THE COURT: Based on your experience and conversations you testified to earlier, would engineers as part of your experience -- what is your view of that?

THE WITNESS: They would take reputation into consideration. I don't know and I could not weigh whether lead time, reputation, availability, all these things have a certain weight. They want to have a product that is of high quality, available for them. Reputation could be something in their decision-making process. I don't know how much.

- So you just said you don't know how much reputation would take into account for lead times, but didn't you testify earlier that lead times were the major reason why engineers would decide on a product?
- 25 Sure. What I said was I don't know how much reputation

- would weigh in their final factor. Their decision-making is a 1
- 2 quality product available for their jobs. Whether reputation
- 3 of the company that sells it is important or not, it could be.
- I don't know how much. 4
- 5 Q. What about a reputation of a product actually working in
- the field? 6
- 7 They would want to see a product that works, yes, that's
- 8 right.
- 9 Q. Wouldn't that be more important than a lead time in
- 10 determining whether to select a product?
- 11 I don't know. Depends what happened with -- what the
- 12 reputation is all about. It's too vague. I mean, it's too
- 13 vaque. The reputation could be all different directions.
- 14 Q. So you're telling me it's vague as to whether a product
- 15 won't work or not? That's vague to you?
- 16 Yes, that's vague to me.
- 17 Okay. Could maybe -- is there a way you could make it more
- 18 clearer as to what a good reputation of a product is versus a
- 19 bad reputation of a product?
- 20 Sure, I can. So an example could be is a product produced
- 21 by a highly prudent production process or not. That's a
- 22 reputation. Is the company mistreating its employees or not?
- 23 That's a reputation. I don't know if that's a decision-making
- 24 process that will weigh in the engineer's mind. It may very
- 25 well be. I don't know.

- 1 Okay. In this catalog, how many of these products are actually made in the United States? 2
- 3 In this catalog that you referred to?
 - Q. Yes.

- 5 MR. BANDINI: Objection.
- 6 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 7 Q. You testified that lead times on iSheetPile Web site are 8 false because some of the products are in stock right now; is
- 9 that correct?
- 10 I did, yes. Α.
- 11 But wouldn't you agree that if a product is not made in the
- 12 United States, that would impact the lead time?
- 13 It would, yes. Also if it's made in the United States. Α.
- 14 I'm sorry. What did you say? Q.
- 15 Α. Whether it's made in the United States or not, lead time is
- impacted. Lead time would be impacted. 16
- 17 If Skyline doesn't publish its lead times, how is anyone to
- know what's an accurate lead time is? 18
- 19 We put lead times on our quotes. Α.
- 20 Did you ever provide those quotes to PilePro? 0.
- 21 Α. No.
- 22 So you only provide those quotes to your customers?
- 23 Sure, yes. Α.
- 24 So only your customers are allowed to know what an accurate
- 25 lead time is?

- 1 MR. BANDINI: Objection.
- THE COURT: Sustained. 2
- 3 If you could turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit 19. I think
- 4 that's the next in your binder.
- 5 Α. Yes.
- 6 So could you just help the jury remember, this is an HZM
- 7 product or an HZM system? I'm sorry. I don't recall.
- It shows the HZM system with its individual components. 8
- 9 So what is an HZM product? Ο.
- 10 An HZM product -- an HZM, as known in the market, would be
- 11 a combination of a beam, a connector, and a sheet pile.
- 12 So when somebody refers to an HZM product, what do you
- 13 interpret that to mean?
- 14 It would mean the entire wall of all components, including Α.
- 15 all components as I described.
- Including all components as you described? 16 0.
- 17 Yes, uh-huh. Α.
- 18 Q. So an HZM --
- 19 THE COURT: You have to say yes or no.
- 20 THE WITNESS: Sorry, yes.
- 21 THE COURT: And, Ms. Ghavimi, do you want this, since
- 22 it's on the screen, published to the jury?
- 23 MS. GHAVIMI: Yes.
- 24 BY MS. GHAVIMI:
- 25 So if one were to, say, use the term "an HZM product," you

- would not think of just a connector? 1
- I would not think of just a connector, no. 2 Α.
- 3 And if one were to say an HZM product, you would not think
- of just AZ 14-770, would you? 4
- 5 No, I wouldn't. Α.
- So if you were to look at AZ 14-770 on the iSheetPile Web 6
- 7 site, you would not describe that as an HZM product, would you?
- 8 Α. No, I would not.
- 9 Q. And if you were to view the RZD/U connector on the
- 10 iSheetPile Web site, you would not consider that an HZM
- 11 product, would you?
- 12 A. Well, I would. Yes, I would, because the product as such
- 13 has no other use than being used in a combi wall like this.
- 14 Q. An RZD connector has no other use than being used in an HZM
- 15 system?
- 16 Yes, or similar solution, yes.
- 17 It cannot be used with a different kind of sheet pile? Ο.
- A. Yeah, you're right, it could be used with a different brand 18
- 19 of sheet pile, yes. Sorry. That's true. You're right. Ιt
- 20 could be used with a different brand of sheet pile, yes.
- 21 So my original question was you would not consider an RZD/U
- 22 connector, looking at it on the iSheetPile Web site, as an HZM
- 23 product, would you?
- 24 MR. BANDINI: Objection. Asked and answered.
- 25 THE COURT: Overruled.

Correct.

Α.

1

- So you mentioned that you viewed the iSheetPile Web site 2 Q.
- 3 when the warning, infringement warning, that is shown here on
- 4 Exhibit 19 was placed, initially placed; is that correct?
- 5 Α. Yes.
- 6 Do you recall that? 0.
- 7 Α. Yes.
- So why did you state earlier it was up there two months 8 Q.
- 9 ago?
- 10 Unfortunately, this process takes forever, and so we've
- 11 been in discussion for months and months and months, and I'm
- 12 sorry. It's been a long time, a lot of documents. I made a
- 13 mistake. And it's not there anymore, which makes it even more
- 14 complex, when was it still there and when not anymore.
- 15 Ο. You don't have any copies of it as it was, do you?
- THE COURT: Sustained. 16
- 17 Do you recall looking through the entire Web site as it
- 18 existed when the infringement warning was placed?
- 19 Page by page by page, you mean? Α.
- 20 0. Yes.
- 21 Not page by page by page. Α.
- 22 Q. What pages did you look at?
- 23 I don't remember. Pages of all -- a number of combinations
- 24 of products.
- 25 Did you look at the RZD/U connector page alone?

GBTHSKY7 De Mey - Cross

- 1 A. I don't know.
- 2 | Q. Did you look at the AZ 1770 page alone?
- 3 A. I don't know. I could have, yes.
- 4 Q. Did you see an infringement warning?
- 5 | A. Yes.
- 6 Q. I'm going to turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit 280.
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. You recall this document?
- 9 | A. I do.
- 10 | Q. Did you see this document at the time it was sent to
- 11 | Skyline?
- 12 A. Yes, it was forwarded to me.
- 13 THE COURT: Can you remind us what Plaintiff's
- 14 Exhibit 280 is.
- 15 | THE WITNESS: Yes. The Exhibit 280 from the
- 16 | plaintiff's side is a letter from John Madonna to Matt
- 17 McLaughlin, who is our salesperson on the West Coast, and he
- 18 | forwarded it to me and our CFO.
- 19 | THE COURT: Is that an e-mail attaching the --
- 20 THE WITNESS: E-mail forwarding included attachment.
- 21 THE COURT: All right.
- 22 BY MS. GHAVIMI:
- 23 | Q. Before I publish it to the jury, your Honor, do you see the
- 24 second sentence?
- 25 A. I do.

XY7 De Mey - Cross

- Q. Was there a discussion internally about the second sentence?
- 3 MR. BANDINI: Objection.
- 4 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 5 MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, I'd like to publish this to the jury.
- 7 THE COURT: You may.
- 8 BY MS. GHAVIMI:
- 9 Q. Now, you testified earlier that -- about the last
- 10 paragraph.
- 11 | A. Yes.

17

- 12 | Q. Just to recall for the jury that this -- and I apologize.
- 13 | I don't recall exactly what you said.
- 14 THE COURT: Ms. Ghavimi, just ask your question.
- Q. Yes. This letter says: Please respond immediately should this information have any effect on the current installation of
- THE COURT: Ms. Ghavimi, number one, everybody's
- 19 looking at it. It's on the screen. Number two, you can't read
- 20 | that quickly or the court reporter can't keep up.
- 21 MS. GHAVIMI: I apologize.
- 22 | THE COURT: So just ask the question.
- 23 Q. This last question caused concern at Skyline; is that
- 24 | correct?
- 25 A. It did, yes.

Skyline --

4

5

- Q. And could you please remind the jury why it caused you concern.
 - A. The concern was, as explained before, was we already had delivered steel, and some of the steel was already installed or was being installed in the ground.
- 6 Q. Isn't it true you had another delivery on the way, though?
- 7 A. It's possible, yeah.
- Q. Did you make any effort to stop that delivery in response to this letter?
- 10 A. No, I don't think -- I don't believe we did.
- Q. So you still continued on and delivered more steel even after you received this letter to John Madonna?
- 13 A. We have an agreement with a customer and engagement to a customer to supply steel.
- Q. So it didn't cause you that much concern?
- MR. BANDINI: Objection.
- 17 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 18 A. Sure, it did give us concern. One is independent of the other.
- Q. Did you complete the delivery of the steel for this entire project to Madonna?
- 22 A. I believe we did.
- 23 Q. Did Madonna pay you for this project?
- 24 A. Yes, they did.
- 25 | Q. Did they pay you in full for this project?

- Α. Yes, late, but yes.
- How much did they pay you in total for this project? 2 Q.
- 3 I don't remember. 2 million some sort, little more. Α.
- Wasn't it \$2.6 million? 4 Q.
- Possible, yes. 5 Α.
- 6 THE COURT: Mr. De Mey, just keep your voice up, if 7 you could.
- THE WITNESS: Yes. 8
- 9 Q. How much did Madonna ask you to pay for their attorney's 10 fees?
- 11 Less than \$5,000, as stated.
- 12 And I believe you were afraid you'd have to rip up the
- 13 whole project out of the ground; is that correct?
- A. Possibly, yes. 14
- 15 Q. But isn't it true that that's -- let me rephrase that.
- 16 Have you ever had to do that on a project?
- We haven't done it, no. That doesn't mean it's not 17
- 18 impossible.
- 19 Have you ever known of it to happen on a project?
- 20 I don't recall. Α.
- 21 Has Skyline received infringement letters from other people
- 22 in its experience as a business?
- 23 MR. BANDINI: Objection.
- 24 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 25 I don't think so, no.

- 1 Has Skyline ever received letters threatening lawsuits
- before? 2

7

- 3 Has Skyline ever received letters?
- 4 Letters threatening lawsuits previously regarding Q.
- 5 construction contracts?
- No, not like this, I don't think. 6 Α.
 - Could you explain that "not like this."
- Well, here we deliver the product, and PilePro contacts 8
- 9 directly our customer saying that there will be consequences
- 10 for possibly legal litigation and legal cost if they continue
- using this product line. We've never had something like this 11
- 12 that we sold or produced, no.
- 13 Is Skyline a sophisticated corporation? 0.
- 14 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 15 Q. How many projects does Skyline install a year?
- Plenty. I don't know. Couple thousand. 16 Α.
- 17 A couple thousand? Q.
- 18 Α. Yes.
- 19 And what are the -- how much does each project cost? I'm
- 20 sorry. How much does Skyline make on each project?
- 21 MR. BANDINI: Objection.
- 22 THE COURT: Sustained.
- 23 Skyline is installing thousands of projects a year, and you
- 24 have never received an infringement letter before?
- 25 Α. Yes, sure.

- 1 Okay. You never received a letter threatening suit from a contractor, a disgruntled customer? 2
 - But not -- not patent related, not something --
 - Any kind? Q.

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

5 Oh, of course. Okay. Maybe I misunderstood your question 6 before, and I apologize for that.

In your context that you describe now, contractors will all the time send letters possibly suing you if you deliver late, if you deliver the wrong material, if something happens on the job site you could be involved in, yeah, absolutely, which is why we thought this was very important. If any possible damages would be here, we would be liable for liquidated damages, late delivery would be a huge problem, and with a huge possible legal bill and litigation with our own customer.

- Is Skyline familiar with the Miller Act?
- 17 THE COURT: Yes or no?
- 18 Α. I'm not.
- You testified that the AZ wall sells in the U.S. ten times 19 20 more than the HZM; is that correct?
- 21 Α. Yes.
- 22 That -- and I believe I had this -- this is what you said.
- That the sales without the HZM were 100 to 150 million per year 23
- 24 from 2013 to 2015; is that correct?
- 25 Yes. Α.

- So what were the sales of the HZM during 2013 to 2015? 1
- Do the math. Between 10 and 15 million, depending on the 2 Α.
- 3 year. One year could be five; one year could be 15 or 20,
- 4 depends. On average between 10 and 15 million per year.
- 5 Q. I'm sorry. I'm not a math person. So that's the
- 6 percentage of that in your business, sales of HZM?
- 7 MR. BANDINI: Objection.
- THE COURT: Sustained. 8
- 9 So isn't it true that to build a typical port, you have to
- 10 use a combi wall system?
- 11 No, that's not true.
- 12 Why is that not true?
- 13 Because it's not. Α.
- 14 So to build a port to sustain a sea wall, you can use an
- 15 AZ --
- 16 Absolutely. Α.
- 17 -- wall alone? Ο.
- 18 Α. Yes.
- 19 Q. Okay.
- 20 THE COURT: Ms. Ghavimi, I assume we can take down
- 21 Plaintiff's Exhibit 280?
- 22 MS. GHAVIMI: Yes.
- 23 THE COURT: All right.
- 24 MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, I have about an hour more.
- 25 I don't know --

- 1 THE COURT: You have about 12 minutes more today.
- 2 MS. GHAVIMI: Okay.
- 3 THE COURT: Use that up, please.
- 4 Did you ever guarantee lead times in your contracts?
- 5 Once we sign a contract with a customer, we will deliver on
- time. 6
- 7 Q. But I think you said that, you know, you work with
- customers for unforeseen situations that may delay deliveries; 8
- 9 isn't that correct?
- 10 No, I said accelerate deliveries.
- What if there is an unforeseen delay? Do you reimburse the 11
- 12 customer for that?
- 13 Α. Depends on the situation.
- 14 Okay. Isn't it true that projects typically have serial
- deliveries? 15
- 16 Depends on the job. Α.
- 17 Okay. What is the size of a typical project for Skyline?
- 18 MR. BANDINI: Objection.
- THE COURT: Sustained. 19
- 20 Did the Madonna project have serial deliveries?
- 21 I think it did, yes. Α.
- 22 How long did it take from the beginning to end to deliver
- 23 the product to Madonna?
- 24 Α. I don't know. I'm sure you have the documents.
- 25 Didn't it take longer than 16 weeks?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α. I don't know.

THE COURT: Mr. De Mey, what is your understanding? How are you using the term "serial deliveries"? Could you just explain what that means.

THE WITNESS: Well, I don't think I was using it, but I think as I understood it is deliveries could be done, if it's by a vessel, could be coming at once, entire thing; it could be coming in parts and pieces, a function of vessel availability or room available or time available or urgency of the job. there could be partial shipments possibly. There could be truck delivery by a very small quantity.

So in the function of the job, it could be everything or could be just one-tenth or a 20th of the job. So there's no black or white. There's several solutions possible.

- Q. So if the timing of a delivery varies so much, how can you say that any one depiction of a lead time is accurate or inaccurate?
- Because what matters is the starting time.
- So your interpretation of lead time as presented on the iSheetPile Web site is what?
- It would be, one, can you start delivering material that will keep up with the speed in which the contractor will use it.
 - Is that statement listed anywhere in the iSheetPile Web site?

- De Mey Cross
- That's how the entire industry would use it or see it. 1 Α.
- The entire industry? Do you speak for the entire industry? 2 Q.
- 3 I don't speak for the entire industry. That's how I would
- assume everybody understands it, yes. 4
- 5 Isn't it also true that a larger shipment, whether serial
- 6 deliveries or not, would take a longer time to deliver?
- 7 A. Not necessarily, no. Yeah, if you need one truck, yes, it
- could be delivered quicker. But whether you buy 200 ton or 400 8
- 9 ton or 500 ton of steel, it could be all arriving at the same
- 10 time because the production process in the steel mill is almost
- 11 similar, whether it's 200 tons or 500 tons.
- 12 Are those caveats listed on iSheetPile Web site?
- 13 A. No, as I said before, there's no volume or any reference to
- 14 anything.
- 15 Q. Are you sure?
- 16 I believe it is, yes. Α.
- 17 Okay. Can we turn to Plaintiff's Exhibit 574. Ο.
- 18 Α. Yes.
- 19 MS. GHAVIMI: If I could publish this to the jury,
- 20 your Honor?
- 21 THE COURT: You may.
- 22 Okay. What is this product shown here? Q.
- 23 HZM 1180M, etc. Α.
- 24 Ο. Is this an HZM product?
- 25 Α. Yes.

- 1 If you could turn to the second page --
- 2 Α. I can.
- 3 -- where it's highlighted. 0.
- Α. Yes. 4
- 5 I think the ArcelorMittal HZM 1180M D-12, AZ 19-700, I
- believe you said has available 16 weeks. You previously stated 6
- 7 that's incorrect?
- I did. 8 Α.
- 9 Okay. Do you see there under the column that says weight,
- 10 and it says 68.41. Do you see that?
- 11 I see that, yes.
- 12 Up there it says "pounds per feet squared." What is
- 13 68.41 pounds per feet squared, I quess, to a layman?
- 14 A. It means what is the weight of the steel used to cover a
- 15 square footage of wall, of barrier wall or wall, you're
- 16 building.
- 17 Q. Okay. And over on the right-hand side -- well, then the
- 18 second column says: Bending moment capacity. Could you
- 19 explain that to us.
- 20 That is the strength of the solution and the capacity that
- 21 it has or the force or weight it can take. The load it can
- 22 carry is probably the better term. The higher the number, the
- 23 stronger the solution.
- 24 So doesn't this describe for a certain weight and poundage
- 25 amount of steel, that's how long it will take to deliver on

average?

1

- 2 No, that's not what it says.
- 3 Q. If you could look at this small writing down here where it
- 4 says, "Sections listed above," I believe it was blown up in the
- 5 previous questioning.
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Could you read the last two sentences for the jury.
- "Section displayed are thought to be relevant and available 8
- 9 for delivery and use in the U.S. market within the availability
- 10 stated in sufficient quantities for a typical job. Please
- 11 inquire with the manufacturer for actual and specific
- 12 availability."
- 13 So that's telling the person who views it to inquire with 0.
- 14 the manufacturer; right?
- 15 Α. In small letters, yes.
- But it's still telling them? 16 Ο.
- 17 Yeah, it is. Α.
- 18 If you could look right over to the right where you see the
- words "manufacturer"? 19
- 20 Α. Yes.
- 21 Who is listed underneath that? Q.
- 22 A. ArcelorMittal.
- 23 And then it says "distributor." Who's listed underneath
- 24 that?
- 25 Skyline Steel. Α.

- So PilePro is presenting on this Web site that the 1
- manufacturer of this product is ArcelorMittal; isn't that 2
- 3 correct?
- It is, yes. 4 Α.
- 5 Q. And that the distributor of this product is Skyline Steel;
- isn't that correct? 6
- 7 Α. It is.
- Nowhere on here are they claiming that they're affiliated 8
- 9 with either ArcelorMittal or Skyline Steel; isn't that correct?
- 10 MR. BANDINI: Objection.
- 11 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 12 Α. Correct.
- 13 An engineer looking at this would know who ArcelorMittal Ο.
- was or is; right? 14
- 15 Α. Some do; some don't, yes.
- And an engineer, who you would agree is sophisticated in 16
- 17 the industry, would know who Skyline Steel is; isn't that
- 18 correct?
- 19 Same answer. Some do; some don't.
- 20 Q. Do you see -- let's go back to the first page -- above the
- 21 product I.D., who does it -- what is the name that's written
- 22 there?
- 23 Α. ArcelorMittal.
- 24 0. It doesn't say PilePro here, does it?
- 25 Α. Not there. Just above it says.

- 1 Right. But right above the product it says ArcelorMittal, doesn't it? 2
- 3 Α. It does, yes.
- So this is identifying the manufacturer of the product? 4 Q.
- Uh-huh. Yes. 5 Α.
- And under "Top Product Alternatives," what does it say? 6
- 7 It gives two alternatives, another HZM solution from
- ArcelorMittal and then an O-Pile solution 4131. 8
- 9 Q. But the first listed alternative is another ArcelorMittal
- 10 product, in fact, another HZM system; isn't that correct?
- 11 It is, yes.
- 12 And if you flip back over to the second page, five of the
- 13 other alternative products listed are ArcelorMittal products?
- 14 A. It may have a longer lead time, but yes, on this chart
- 15 here.
- You don't think that's good advertising for your company? 16
- 17 No, it's negative advertising. I don't think it's good
- 18 advertising, no.
- 19 Q. Now, you said you visited --
- 20 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Ghavimi, we'll stop there
- 21 since it's 4:59.
- 22 Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to break for the
- 23 evening. Let me just remind you that tomorrow please be here
- 24 no later than, I would say, a couple minutes before 9:00
- 25 o'clock in the morning. We will start no later than 9:15. Ι

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

like to have you guys in the box with Mr. De Mey continuing in his testimony at that time.

As I said, I'll do everything in my power to get you guys out as quickly as I can and certainly within the time I promised, but I need you to play your part as well, and that part is to get here on time. We can't -- counsel, can you please refrain from talking until I'm done. Thank you.

I need you to be here on time because we can't start until all eight of you are here. So I know, particularly on days like today with the weather we had, it can take a little longer to make your way around the city. I know plenty of you are coming from Westchester and elsewhere. If you could just cushion the amount of time you need to get here to make sure you're here on time, it would be really helpful if we could start here on time.

Just a reminder, to entice you to be here on time, we will have some breakfast and coffee in the jury room, assuming that the cafeteria obliges and delivers what we have ordered.

And then a couple even more important reminders, number one, do not discuss the case with each other, with your friends, your family. Again, you can tell people that you have been selected to serve as a juror on a civil case, but please don't tell anyone anything beyond that.

Number two, don't communicate about the case in any way, shape, or form -- telephone, person, e-mail, Twitter,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

De Mey - Cross

anything. All right. Again, it can only cause trouble for you and for all of us.

Third, don't do any research about the case or anyone involved in the case.

And, finally, please continue to keep an open mind. You've heard some of the evidence. You've heard the opening statements, but there's plenty more evidence to come, and it's certainly not time for you to form any judgments.

Again, just a reminder, please go directly to the jury room tomorrow morning, and please be there a couple minutes before 9:00 so that we can start promptly. And with that, I wish you a very pleasant evening. I thank you for your attention. And you are excused. Thank you.

(Jury excused)

THE COURT: You may be seated. Mr. De Mey, you may step down. All right.

(Continued on next page)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Jury not present)

THE COURT: All right. Just so you know, plaintiff has 12 hours 41 minutes remaining in its time, and defendant has nine hours and 45 minutes remaining in its time.

Two things that I want to raise. One is -- and this is directed to both sides -- I really prefer that you not sort of invoke the jury in your questioning. Just ask your question but don't explain to the jury, read to the jury, remind the jury. It's not necessary, and I would rather you just get to the point and ask your question.

Second, I did want to just raise the listing of PilePro in Skyline's catalog, which was obviously subject of some examination as well. I don't know anything about this issue other than what you mentioned earlier, but I'm struggling to understand what its relevance and significance is, how it's being used, and I don't know how it relates to the settlement agreement that Mr. Badini referred to earlier. Does anyone want to fill me in here?

MR. BADINI: Yes, your Honor. First of all, with respect to your first issue, I do that as a matter of habit, and I apologize and I will try to restrain myself.

THE COURT: All right. I will cure you of the habit by the end of this trial but hopefully before that. Go ahead.

MR. BADINI: Second, we are very concerned about that. The settlement agreement explicitly provided that Skyline had

certain obligations to list PilePro and its products and how folks could get in touch with PilePro to buy its products in the Skyline catalogs. Defendant is trying to take that contractual obligation and turn it into some type of endorsement of PilePro's statements of lead times and other things, and we think that's prejudicial and it requires at a minimum a curative instruction.

THE COURT: A curative instruction to what effect?

MR. BADINI: To the effect that yesterday you heard

that Skyline carried references to PilePro in its catalog. The

jury is instructed that it was required to do so contractually

and is not to infer from that that it was somehow endorsing

PilePro or PilePro's representations on its website. Something

to that effect.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Ghavimi?

MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, it's our position that what is good for the goose is good for the gander. They designated this exhibit. It's a document that was in circulation at the time. The infringement warning was present and at the time that they sued PilePro. We have carefully avoided mentioning this settlement agreement. Yes, they had a contractual obligation to list the website in their catalog, however, we are not using it for that purpose. They can't take away the fact that it was there and that customers saw it. Just as we can't take away the fact that the infringement warning and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

other actions were on the website. It is out there and is what people saw. This case is about the effect on the public, certain members of the public, and the evidence that was out It is our position that it constitutes a waiver of their trademark claims of our use of their name on the trademark, not with respect to the infringement warning, but they have other claims that we infringed -- which we believe are baseless -- by placing their name on the iSheetPile website, simply by identifying the product by its manufacturer that we have infringed their trademark. It is our position that they have waived that through placing the PilePro website in their catalog presenting it to the public. Customers could They could go to the PilePro website, see view that. iSheetPile website and therefore imply a connection between the companies. We are not saying that the connection was based on a settlement agreement. We are not going to mention that. Your Honor has ruled on that. However, if they are claiming that we infringed their trademark and unduly implied that we were associated -- we unduly claimed an association with ArcelorMittal and Skyline vis-a-vis infringing their trademark simply by listing their names on our website, then we have every right to identify for the jury that our website was listed in their catalog. It doesn't matter how it got there. THE COURT: Well, there are a lot of things being

mushed together and mixed together. I guess let me start by

just saying do you have any authority for the proposition that listing the PilePro website in the catalog would constitute a waiver of their trademark claims, let alone where that is done as a contractual obligation pursuant to a settlement agreement in an entirely separate dispute? Do you have any legal authority for that proposition?

MS. GHAVIMI: Well, I have not researched it yet, but I can assure you that I will find some.

THE COURT: Good. So why don't you find some. Until you find some, this argument isn't going to be made. And if you don't find any, I will instruct the jury that they are not to put any weight on that, that that was done pursuant to a legal obligation, and it has no significance with respect to the claims in this case.

Now, separate and apart from that, do you agree that the listing in the catalog was a product of the settlement agreement between the parties, that they were required to do that?

MS. GHAVIMI: Yes.

THE COURT: OK. Good. Well, you have a couple days to come up with authority for the proposition that would support the argument you're making. If you don't come up with it, this argument isn't going anywhere, and I'm going to provide a instruction. It strikes me as a far fetched one, and I fail to see how it could possibly constitute a waiver

pursuant to a settlement agreement years before they are contractually obligated to provide that information in their catalog, and that that would somehow give you carte blanche to do whatever you want to do on your website and violate their trademark and falsely accuse them of infringing. It just strikes me as a completely farfetched argument.

MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, it's our position that in the minds of the public, the reason the website is in their catalog is irrelevant because the effect of the presence of the website in the catalog is the same. It's not as if the catalog says, yeah, we're only required to put this in here because of a settlement agreement.

THE COURT: Well, were you authorized to use the trademark that was registered to ArcelorMittal and that Skyline was licensed to use?

MS. GHAVIMI: It wasn't registered at the time.

THE COURT: It is today, and there is testimony that even as late as last week that trademark was still being used on the website. So, do you have authorization to use that trademark, and do you have any argument that by listing the PilePro website, which then links to another website, that that would somehow constitute authorization to use their trademark?

MS. GHAVIMI: We don't have authorization. We have defenses of fair use, license, and may have additional defenses that we will present in our closing on the naked license that

came out during testimony today.

THE COURT: All right. Well, again, I don't -- this strikes me as a real stretch, and I can't imagine that there is any authority out there that would support an argument of waiver. I'm not going to cross the bridge of the various doctrines that you just invoked, but you should certainly be prepared to support me with authority that would support those arguments as well, because I don't see it based on the listing of the website in their catalog, which again was pursuant to a legal obligation.

So, we will table it and see if defendant can come up with any legal authority, and then we will decide what to do from there.

Now, anything else we need to discuss other than the remaining deposition designations for the Maake deposition?

MR. BROWN: Yes, your Honor. On their expert --

THE COURT: Microphone.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Persampieri, their expert witness, I believe that some of his materials are designated attorneys eyes only. I know that was done in a lot of areas in this case, and I'm wondering if that is still relevant now, or if that no longer applies as I'm preparing for the cross of him, because it will be in court, and I would like to prepare for it using my client. Am I allowed to give it to my client to prepare for the cross of that particular witness? That's my

question.

THE COURT: For some reason there is a picture of a baby on my screen. All right.

MR. BROWN: That's not us, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Badini?

MR. BADINI: This has come out of the blue. I would be happy to discuss it with counsel this evening and see what he has in mind and work out a reasonable accommodation. I told counsel earlier today that we are likely to call Mr.

Persampieri last, so we have some time to make that call.

THE COURT: Great. Why don't you see if you guys can work it out, and we can revisit it if there is a dispute. If it doesn't get reraised, I will assume you have resolved it.

MR. BROWN: And a scheduling matter. Are we certain that we would be on trial Monday if we don't finish Thursday? Or is there a chance we would start on Tuesday?

THE COURT: Why on earth would we?

MR. BROWN: I don't know. I don't know if there are any other trials that might come up on the criminal docket on Monday.

THE COURT: Nope. Before we get to Maake, can you tell me who is on tap for tomorrow, Mr. Badini, after Mr. De Mey finishes?

MR. BADINI: There is also another open issue, unless you want to discuss the schedule first. You're the boss, your

Honor.

THE COURT: Why don't you tell me who is on tap for tomorrow and then --

MR. BADINI: Let me check my schedule. So we will finish De Mey. We are playing Madonna, and then intend to call Mr. Wendt. And, depending on how far we get, then we would play McShane, Maake and Wheeler, I believe, in that order.

THE COURT: OK. And are there depositions coming down the pike after that? And when do you expect to get me --

MR. BADINI: Yes, there are, your Honor. The tentative order after that is Messrs. Whitworth, Williams and Mitchell, and then we would probably end with Ms. Gorog and Mr. Persampieri. And I believe we were shooting for tonight or tomorrow morning -- I don't know; I'm looking at my colleagues -- for the other designations.

MS. WESTCOTT: We had intended to -THE COURT: Microphone. Thank you.

MS. WESTCOTT: Sorry. We had intended to provide the court with the remainder of the designations tonight for discussion tomorrow morning if need be. I did have one question on that. We got an order last night to ECF file the designations. Of course the designated testimony is now going to be public, but if there is confidential information in them, do you want us to redact? Because we would be filing the whole transcript.

THE COURT: And I assume the confidential portions are not any of the designated portions.

MS. WESTCOTT: Well, certainly at least the ones that are designated will no longer be confidential after they've been read.

THE COURT: So, let me modify what I said. I didn't take that into account in my order. I do ultimately want these things to be part of the public record, but why don't you submit them by e-mail, as you did yesterday, and then with the understanding that after I have resolved all the disputes, that you can redact anything that is not going to be played that is subject to a confidentiality agreement, but that certainly the subjects, the testimony that is the subject of those disputes has to be made part of the record so it's clear. All right?

MS. WESTCOTT: Thank you.

THE COURT: I can't guarantee that I will be prepared to talk about the remaining depositions tomorrow morning, but it doesn't sound like they would likely be played tomorrow, and my hope is I would get those to you if not before tomorrow morning, then tomorrow afternoon.

All right. What else before Maake?

MR. BADINI: Before Maake? Your Honor, right before the Mr. De Mey cross, I was handed two defendants exhibits, 107 and 108. We are having a hard time, given the way the defendants exhibit list is presented in the pretrial order, and

given the fact that these have no Bates numbers, to figure out whether they were produced and whether they are on the exhibit list. So perhaps counsel can illuminate us, because we can't figure out whether they were on the exhibit list or not.

MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, I sent these exhibits to counsel this morning, and we have not had a chance to meet and confer on them. I don't know what their objections are. I guess we can discuss it here.

THE COURT: Well, I think their first objection is that they don't know what they are. But they are not on your exhibit list that was filed in the joint pretrial order?

MS. GHAVIMI: One of these documents, the one that says Exhibit A -- OK, let me pull them out.

D 107 are attachments that are referenced in --

THE COURT: It's a yes or no question. Are these on the exhibit list that you attached to the joint pretrial order?

MS. GHAVIMI: No. D107 is incorporated by reference to a document that is on our exhibit list. These are documents that were produced at the deposition of John Madonna by John Madonna. That's why they do not have Bates numbers.

THE COURT: OK. And what is the reason that these were not listed on the exhibit list?

MS. GHAVIMI: Because they were not produced electronically, I did not have access to them. In the preparation for this trial I added them as I was preparing.

All I can say is two months ago I did not have them and decided that they were relevant because they were referenced in other documents that are on our exhibit list.

THE COURT: They are not coming into evidence. I made clear at the final pretrial conference on Wednesday that the exhibit list attached to the pretrial order was final unless good cause could be shown for anything not appearing on that list. You obviously did have possession of these at least at the time of the Madonna deposition. You certainly have had ample time in the two months since the joint pretrial order was prepared and the exhibit list was attached to it to propose that they be added without any prejudice or any issue of that sort. The fact that you didn't have copies in a certain format when your cocounsel obviously did, this is the latest instance of two hands of counsel not talking to each other. It isn't good cause, and they're not coming into evidence. Next.

All right. Let's talk about Maake, and then I will let you go for the evening.

I think there are four designations that I wanted to talk about. The first is on page 40. No, excuse me, 20. It's a PilePro objection, so does somebody at the back table want to fill me in? That is you folks.

MR. BROWN: That would be this table?

MS. GHAVIMI: I'm sorry, your Honor. I need to pull it up.

MR. BADINI: While they're pulling it up, your Honor, I don't want to run afoul of any of the court's practices. Given that Mr. De Mey is still on the stand, is there any rule as to communications with him? Different courts have done different things in my experience.

THE COURT: Let me put it differently. Mr. Ramos or Ms. Ghavimi, do you have any views as to whether and to what extent counsel can communicate with Mr. De Mey, who is obviously a corporate representative here but he is on cross?

MS. GHAVIMI: Considering the fact that I'm going to be asking him questions about similar issues that I had just asked questions today, I believe that they should not be allowed to discuss the case since it's intermingled with his testimony.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Badini, do you have any objection if I instruct you that you are not to communicate with Mr. De Mey except for logistical and scheduling issues?

MR. BADINI: Well, provided the same rule applies to Mr. Wendt.

THE COURT: It certainly would if we break during his cross-examination. So what is goose for the goose is good for the gander, as Ms. Ghavimi just put it.

MR. BADINI: Sure. I have no objection.

THE COURT: Good. So let's do that and err on the side of caution.

All right. Ms. Ghavimi, are you prepared to walk through the Maake deposition now?

MS. GHAVIMI: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Can you point me to your objection to page 20 to 21.

MS. GHAVIMI: We don't see how the fact that Ms. Maake bills PilePro on an hourly basis is relevant — they didn't ask this question of other PilePro employees — how it's relevant to any of her testimony on this matter.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Restagno, are you taking the lead here to too?

MR. RESTAGNO: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

So, first of all, Ms. Maake is not an employee of PilePro. She was a contractor employed by PilePro to render services. It is our position that this time is relevant and goes to foundation for the rest of the testimony establishing the relationship with PilePro and also to her credibility as a witness.

THE COURT: All right. The objection is overruled.

Next is page 63. It's a Skyline objection. So, Mr. Restagno, back to you. 63, 64.

MR. RESTAGNO: Thank you, your Honor. So we object to this testimony on relevance grounds. What we have here is testimony to the effect that iSheetPile was intended to be a site where customers compare solutions and not an e-commerce

site.

The specific issues of the case as they pertain to the Request a Quote feature is our allegations that the site misled customers by effectively giving the bait and switch, showing them one product and then directing them to another, on top of other problems with the website being false lead times and the infringement warning and so on. Whether this site was intended to be an e-commerce site with a shopping cart feature is not relevant to the issues of the case.

THE COURT: Can you just eliminate for me who is Ms. Maake? What is her role here?

MR. RESTAGNO: Your Honor, Ms. Maake served as a liaison between PilePro and the software engineers that made the website, specialized in marketing and PR.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Ghavimi, I certainly think you are entitled to argue that from the evidence that has been admitted, namely the website itself, that there is no shopping cart and it's just an informational tool and so forth. But what possible relevance does her intentions have?

MS. GHAVIMI: Well, this is not her intentions, your Honor. She is talking about the intention of the website as she was instructed for it to be created.

THE COURT: But my -- let me rephrase. What relevance does the intention of the creators of the website have to the issues in this case? In other words, again, you could make the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

argument that there is no shopping cart, this is just providing information and, therefore, it's not confusing, and it's not misleading, and it's not going to divert sales and so on and so forth. But what relevance does the intention of the folks at PilePro or elsewhere in setting up the website have?

MS. GHAVIMI: Because the jurors are going to be looking at the website. They don't have the website to interact and move around and decide for themselves. going to be looking at screen shots and making a decision based on what they see and what other people who have used it who are going to be saying when you go here you get a quote. of this case is about the motivations of what the website is Skyline is arguing this is a bait and switch. It is intended to draw customers in, to select, view the product by infringing our trademark, advertising this, clicking on it, requesting a quote, and then they don't actually give you or sell you a product and switch one of their own. So, testimony about how the website was never intended to be that way is certainly relevant, because that's actually how it is not. that's how we are going to argue it's not. It just serves that it was never like that at all and it is not like that, contrary to how Skyline is going to be arguing and presenting their testimonv.

THE COURT: All right, the objection is sustained. I think you can certainly make the argument from the website

itself that it's not a bait and switch and what have you, but I don't see what relevance their intentions have. And to the extent that the jury is limited to the screen shots, that's a product of counsel's decision to try the case in the manner that you are trying it. You certainly could have figured out some way to capture in a more dynamic fashion the website short of the proposal made last week to do it on a live basis.

Next is page 138, PilePro's objections. This is really 138 through 140, and part of my problem is I don't know what the exhibits being referenced here are.

Ms. Ghavimi?

MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, we object to this testimony to the extent that, one, it refers to the placement of the infringement warning on the website, that they're trying to attribute an e-mail exchange between Ms. Maake and Mr. Wendt and imply ownership and some kind of authorization, when we believe Mr. Wendt is here. They can ask him that question himself.

This testimony is irrelevant and will be prejudicial because we do not have the opportunity to cross-examine

Ms. Maake or this document. I don't know if they intend to use these documents or introduce them into evidence with Mr. Wendt. We haven't received their proposed exhibits.

And, you know, they are just talking about exhibits. You know, there is no exhibits in front of the jury to look at.

So, I mean it's kind of -- it's just going to confuse the jury because they are just talking about e-mails, and it's really nothing relevant to --

THE COURT: All right. Well, Mr. Restagno, let me turn to you, and let me also pose a broader question, which is to the extent that the portions of the depositions do reference exhibits, is it the parties' intention to offer those in connection with the deposition?

MR. RESTAGNO: It is, your Honor. And furthermore, I will note that PilePro has not objected to either of those exhibits, despite objecting to this testimony, which is entirely relevant, as it deals with e-mail exchanges concerning the '543 patent.

THE COURT: All right. And again just as a process matter, is the plan to say we're playing the deposition and pursuant to the deposition we offer the following exhibits? Is that the way you were planning to proceed?

MR. RESTAGNO: Yes, the exhibits will be shown on the screen, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. And I am guessing, as they often are, they are not necessarily going to correspond to the numbers used in the deposition? Is that a fair assumption?

MR. BADINI: I believe with only one exception -which I believe is Madonna where somebody screwed up -- they do
correspond, at least on the plaintiff's side, with the ones

that are in the pretrial order.

THE COURT: All right. The objection to the testimony we are discussing is overruled. And then more broadly what you should plan to do is when you say we next call by video deposition Ms., you know, Kristin Maake or whatever it is, and pursuant to that deposition offer the following exhibits, and then we can deal with those. Let's make sure there are no objections before that's done, and that any potential objections outside the presence of the jury. And then if there is a discrepancy between the number that was used in the deposition and the number that is being used at trial, make a record of that, and I will make sure that the jury understands that issue.

All right. The last designation at issue is pages 161 to 162. This is a Skyline objection. Mr. Restagno?

MR. RESTAGNO: Yes, thank you, your Honor. So, this testimony is objectionable. It deals almost entirely with the circumstances of Mr. McShane leaving PilePro as observed by Ms. Maake. We think it is entirely irrelevant and potentially prejudicial.

THE COURT: Ms. Ghavimi?

MS. GHAVIMI: Your Honor, as we said before, yesterday or this morning -- I forget -- it is our position that Mr. McShane was a disloyal employee, and it is also our testimony that it was his decision to place the warning and

content of the warning on the website, and he was the person who interacted with Ms. Maake, and this testimony regarding her communication and relationship with him "When I first started at PilePro, Gerry was my go-to person" is highly relevant.

MR. BADINI: Your Honor, I hate to jump in here, but
Mr. Restagno would not know this, because he has been dealing
with the deposition designations. But this is precisely why
there is a problem with introducing other litigation into this
case. PilePro has made precisely this same argument that
Mr. McShane was a disloyal employee in the arbitration between
Mr. McShane and Mr. Wendt, and the arbitrator soundly rejected
that and ruled against Mr. Wendt. And now they want to
resurface the same theory after it has been adjudicated against
them. And if they resurface that theory, it would only be fair
for us to introduce the finding in the arbitration that
Mr. McShane was not a disloyal employee. And that's the
problem with this testimony.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to sustain the objection. I don't think this has much probative value with respect to even making the argument that Mr. McShane was a disloyal employee. It just basically says in her opinion that there were unusual circumstances surrounding his departure, and it really doesn't have much more to inform it. And I also think on Rule 403 grounds, in light of the issues that Mr. Badini just mentioned, that it would raise all sorts of

problems. So that objection is sustained.

All right. I think that covers all the depositions that have been presented. Any last issues for tonight? It's been a long day. I am happy to let you guys go.

Mr. Badini, you are going to prepare a proposed curative instruction with respect to the spoliation issue.

Obviously the sooner you can submit that -- and you should do so by ECF -- the better, and we will take it up at some point tomorrow.

Please be here a few minutes before nine, and let my staff know if there are issues to discuss, as I'm guessing there will be. I will plan to be on the bench no later than nine. And I want Mr. De Mey on the stand and everyone ready to go with the jury at 9:15.

All right. I wish you all a pleasant evening, and I will see you tomorrow morning.

MR. BADINI: Thank you, your Honor.

(Trial adjourned to November 30, 2016 at 9:00 a.m.)

								I	NE	ΈX	: С	F	ΕX	AM	IN	ΑT	IO	N			
Examin	ati	on	l	of	:																Page
LAUREN'	T D	E	ME	ΞY																	
Direct	Ву	M	īr.	. E	3ar	nd:	in	i.	•				•						•	•	.82
Direct	Ву	M	Ir.	. E	3ac	diı	ni		•	•	•	•								•	130
Cross :	Ву :	Ms		Gh	nav	/ir	mi														164
									ΡI	ΔI	NT	'IF	F	ΕX	ΗI	ΒI	TS				
Exhibi	t N	Ο.																			Received
584	•								•												.82
306	•	•		•		•		•	•		•	•	•	•	•				•	•	.96
308	•								•											•	102
11	•						•			•											106
280	•			•		•		•	•		•	•	•	•	•				•	•	134
573	•								•	•										•	145
574	•						•		•	•											147
575	•						•		•	•											151
576	•			•		•		•	•		•	•	•	•					•	•	152
577	•	•				•		•	•				•	•	•			•	•	•	153
579	•								•					•						•	154
305	•								•	•				•						•	170